

# Appendix

## Secretary McNamara Moves To Improve Supply Management

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for many years congressional committees, the Hoover Commissions, and other objective groups have endeavored to bring about more efficiency and economy in the Department of Defense procurement activities.

In 1958 I sponsored an amendment to the Department of Defense Reorganization Act which gave the Secretary of Defense broad authority with respect to more efficient management of common supplies and services. It is extremely gratifying to me to know that Secretary McNamara is now using this broad authority to consolidate the sprawling activities within the Defense Establishment. Only yesterday he announced the creation of a Defense Supply Agency which would have broad authority in the management of common supplies.

An excellent article appears in the Wall Street Journal today, which I insert herewith in the RECORD:

**PENTAGON MOVES TOWARD FORMING AGENCY TO CENTRALIZE PURCHASING FOR ALL SERVICES**

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon took the first step toward setting up a central procurement agency that could ultimately handle common supply purchasing and service activities for all branches of the military.

Plans were announced to establish a Defense Supply Agency that will lump the present "single managers"—outfits that buy certain supplies for the entire Pentagon—into one unit. This new agency is the organizational shell that is expected to become the Pentagon's central procurement arm by expanding its control over military buying.

Defense Secretary McNamara ordered the top priority project in an effort to achieve greater efficiency and economy. A central procurement agency with broad powers, defense officials say, will reduce overhead costs, tighten management control over the massive military procurement program and cut red tape for private companies selling to the Pentagon.

Eventually, the new agency may buy, maintain, and distribute every kind of item—from food to aircraft parts—commonly used by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In addition, Pentagon policymakers are considering assigning the agency management of all common service activities, such as internal auditing, weather forecasting, and post exchange management.

While looking toward greater consolidation of purchasing, officials note that a central procurement agency would not handle the major military "hardware" items, such as bombers, missiles, and ships. Rarely are

these weapons common to all military services, though defense leaders do hope some triservice aircraft can be developed in the future.

### M'NAMARA FAVORS CONSOLIDATION

The entire program is in line with Secretary McNamara's desire to consolidate top-level control of defense operations and merge as many activities as possible. Recently, for instance, he ordered the merger of all military intelligence into a single Defense Intelligence Agency.

Efforts to establish the new procurement agency are bound to meet some resistance since the military services will certainly lose some of the control they have over supply activities. Nonetheless, defense leaders have decided they must begin to set up a central procurement outfit. If the Pentagon successfully brings under the Defense Supply Agency all the supply items that defense officials are thinking about, it's estimated annual savings may total about \$50 million.

The single managers are units within various military services that handle certain kinds of buying for the entire Pentagon—such as the Army-operated Textile Procurement Agency and Navy-run Military Petroleum Supply Agency. Other single managers are charged with buying and distributing food and medical supplies. And in the past year, the Defense Department has ordered the establishment of single managers for construction supplies, automotive supplies, industrial supplies, and general office supplies.

Defense officials claim major savings through use of these managers. On food, clothing, medical, and petroleum supplies alone, officials report, inventories have been cut down by more than \$500 million since 1956. Annual savings in personnel and operating costs for these supply areas are now running at the rate of \$20 million, according to the Pentagon.

### NEW SINGLE MANAGER EXPECTED

As another step toward merging common supply activities, Mr. McNamara is expected to add soon a new single manager for electrical and electronic supplies. This unit, too, would be placed under the central procurement outfit—along with others to be created in future years. Candidates for inclusion under single managership before long include aeronautical spares, or standard aircraft components such as engines, and chemical supplies.

Placing this growing number of single managers under a single agency would offer many advantages, according to defense sources. It would allow the Pentagon to reduce inventories, obtain better prices through quantity purchases, and reduce the number of military personnel devoted to supply activities.

For companies selling to the Defense Department, it would mean dealing with fewer people and a central agency.

Defense officials note they've already started moving toward centralized management in at least one new activity, private line telephones. Recently, the Pentagon approved a plan setting up the Defense Department—rather than the separate military branches—as the central control point for management and leasing of private line communications. As a result, for the first time the Defense Department will be treated as a single customer when leasing private

line communications facilities from common carriers. In the past, each military service separately leased its own communications.

Service activities currently operated by the Pentagon on a consolidated basis include sea transportation, air transportation, traffic management, communications, and intelligence. Under study for possible future merger are military recruiting, post exchanges, commissaries, housing management, warehousing, and medical and hospital service.

## Gen. Troy H. Middleton Brings Credit to His Native State

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOHN STENNIS**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is a remarkable achievement for most individuals when they devote their lives to a single endeavor or chosen profession in which they excel. Today, I invite the attention of the Senate to the brilliant career of a native Mississippian who has excelled in two major fields.

The man about whom I speak earned wide recognition and great respect as a professional soldier and military leader of outstanding ability in World War I and World War II.

After his retirement from the Army, he was called upon by the governing board of Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge to assume the high post of president of that great institution.

This man, born and educated in Mississippi, in keeping with his acceptance of responsibility, with straightforward conviction took the job as LSU president. And, after 10 years of outstanding service in this capacity he is now about to retire.

It is with great pride in the outstanding career of this remarkable individual that I ask the Senate to join me in saluting a man who has given "two full measures" to the service of mankind.

He is Gen. Troy Houston Middleton, retired Army general and now soon to be retired as president of Louisiana State University.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Jackson, Miss., Clarion-Ledger of August 22, 1961, commending and praising the good works of President Middleton.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**GEN. TROY H. MIDDLETON BRINGS CREDIT TO HIS NATIVE STATE**

Lt. Gen. Troy Houston Middleton has closed his second brilliant career with his



retirement from the presidency of Louisiana State University.

He previously had retired from military service after years of distinguished service and decorations from American and foreign governments.

He has made no announcements, but chances are the general, who will be 72 years of age in a few weeks, will continue quite active for several years longer in administrative or executive capacities.

General Middleton is a native of this State and a graduate of Mississippi State University, class of 1909. He was a campus leader at Starkville, member of the honorary leadership fraternity, Omicron Delta Kappa, and distinguished for his record.

He went on to advance in the Army, make a fine record in the First World War, study at all the top service schools in the Nation, and retire from the military as a full colonel to accept an administrative post at Louisiana State University.

He was, of course, recalled to the service in World War II and earned rapid promotion. He commanded the 45th Infantry division in Sicily and Italy, and then took the VIII Corps through France, Belgium and into Germany. After serving in the Army of Occupation in Germany, he again retired from the service and returned to Louisiana State University as its administrative dean.

The university turned to him in 1951 for its president, and his ability, character and prestige have served the university well in the 10 years that has elapsed.

Under General Middleton, Louisiana State University has grown prodigiously. Enjoying the confidence of the citizens, legislature and governors, the university has received huge appropriations for development. It stands today with a faculty of 700, a general staff of 2,700, with 15,000 students on four campuses.

General Middleton's successor, Dr. John A. Hunter, is a man with several years of experience at Baton Rouge under the Middleton administration.

As the general departed from his campus responsibilities, he was praised by the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, which said among other things about him:

"He has been able to make difficult decisions with a freedom of judgment possible to few, and to command respect in troubled times that few could have commanded. In the same position, a lesser person might more than once have found himself and the institution which he headed in serious difficulty."

Mississippi honors General Middleton as he again "retires" from a job exceedingly well done.

### Manpower Development and Training

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday, September 6, 1961, the House Rules Committee will give a hearing to H.R. 8399, the manpower development and training bill. This legislation, largely the result of the untiring and imaginative efforts of my colleague, the Honorable ELMER HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, is one, if not perhaps the most fundamental pieces of legislation which this Congress will have the opportunity of approving. It should be of tremendous

interest not only to labor, but also to management, for it may well provide the answer in the long run for the successful future or failure of our free enterprise economic system.

Many have recognized its importance, but it is perhaps most ably summed up by an editorial appearing in the New York Times of Friday, September 1, 1961. The editorial follows:

#### JOB TRAINING BILL

Senate passage of the administration's manpower development and training bill is a big step forward in dealing with the hard-core unemployment problem—finding work for those who have lost their jobs because the jobs themselves have been eliminated by new methods and machines.

The bill would make training available to more than 100,000 unemployed workers to enable them to get and fill new jobs—a \$655 million program to run 4 years. It provides funds for a wide range of public and private educational institutions—which will give the training—and financial assistance to the trainees when they need it while learning.

The program is to be given a solid foundation of essential facts through a survey by the Secretary of Labor to determine what skills are called for and where—all in relation to jobs and workers available. The Secretary will use State employment agencies in getting this information and also in the selection of trainees and their referral.

A rapidly growing number of private companies, including some of the Nation's largest, are retraining their own employees for new jobs when those now held are eliminated in the march of technological change.

But corporate retraining does not help the workers who have already lost their jobs. Federal action is also imperative. The bill passed in the Senate was approved by the House Education and Labor Committee on July 27 but is still in the hands of the Rules Committee awaiting clearance to the House floor.

### Seat Belts Could Save 5,000 Lives in America Per Year

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, earlier this session I introduced a bill, S. 2191, requiring that all automobiles manufactured for sale in interstate commerce after January 1, 1962, be equipped with anchors for seat belts. Naturally, I have been attracted to reports of activities by many groups and organizations—both private and governmental—urging seat belts to save lives and reduce injuries.

In August, my home State of South Dakota, under the leadership of Gov. Archie Gubbrud, observed a special highway safety month and the week of August 20-26 was Safety Belt Week.

Here in Washington, D.C., the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee, working on this problem, has issued a statement that 5,000 lives could have been saved last year by the use of seat belts.

The Public Health Service, American Medical Association, National Safety Council, General Federation of Women's Clubs, and numerous other organizations, in addition to law-enforcement bodies, are doing something about this idea.

A study by the Auto Industries group on "Seat Belt Installation and Use" estimates that over 2 million automobiles are now equipped with seat belts, based on a nationwide poll. This is about 3.3 percent of the Nation's automobiles. A release on this poll was issued on August 19, 1961.

A second article, published in the American Farm Bureau Federation Official Newsletter of August 7, 1961, reports that the Kansas Farm Bureau is promoting the use of seat belts and has sold approximately 8,500 since 1956, when the promotion campaign began.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from these releases be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the American Farm Bureau Federation's Official News Letter, Aug. 7, 1961]

#### KANSAS FARM BUREAU PROMOTES SALE OF AUTOMOBILE SEAT BELTS

Using the slogan, "Your Life Could Depend On It," Kansas Farm Bureau has sold approximately 8,500 seat belts since the organization started promoting the use of safety belts in 1956.

The safety department points out to farmers in Kansas that thousands of postaccident investigations and countless tests have proved conclusively that auto seat belts can prevent injury and save lives.

Promotional material emphasizes that seat belts are no substitute for common-sense. Belts are a safety measure to prevent serious injury after a collision occurs, but the best way to avoid being killed or injured is not to have an accident.

In addition to using actual reports from people who have been kept from being killed or seriously injured because of seat belts, the safety department tries to educate members by using facts from the National Safety Council.

Seat belts will help in the following ways in case of an accident:

Keep you from being ejected; reduce the impact if you should hit an interior surface; help keep the driver in his seat after a jolt and enable him to maintain better control of his car; help you survive crashes which would otherwise mean certain death.

If you crash, seat belts will not prevent all injuries; help you in a nonsurvivable collision. If the car is crushed or demolished, it makes no difference if you wear a seat belt or not; cause any serious injuries themselves. If you are bruised by the restraining belt, chances are the impact would have killed or badly injured you without the belt; help you as much if they are not properly installed.

It would be impossible to measure the good which has been done by the 8,500 seat belts sold by Kansas Farm Bureau. The belts will not prevent accidents, but in case of an accident they should help the person wearing them. They also tend to serve as a constant reminder to be careful.

#### SEAT BELT INSTALLATION AND USE POLL

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It is estimated over 2 million automobiles using our streets and highways are now equipped with seat belts for passenger safety. This estimate, based on results of the first nationwide poll of seat



belt installation and use, indicates a growing acceptance of this proven automotive safety feature.

In revealing results of the poll, M. R. Darlington, Jr., managing director, of the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee stated: "The fact that 3.3 percent of our automobiles are equipped with seat belts is surprisingly high in view of the relatively recent public acceptance of their use. It is also particularly encouraging to note that more than one-third of the seat belt users contacted in the poll use them at all times to protect their families and friends."

#### THREE OF FOUR ACCIDENTS NEAR HOME

"It would seem apparent that regular seat belt users have become aware of the facts that three out of four traffic deaths take place within a radius of 25 miles of home," he added, "and more than one-half of injury producing or fatal accidents occur at speeds of less than 40 miles an hour."

"Substantial increases in seat belt sales, as well as public knowledge that all 1962 model cars will be equipped with seat belt anchorages, should bring about a decided change in future polls," Mr. Darlington said. "Public officials and organizations urging the installation and use of seat belts are confident a noticeable improvement will also be reflected in traffic accident statistics."

Recent studies indicate that 5,000 lives might have been saved last year if all occupants of automobiles had been using seat belts. Studies also indicate that serious injuries to occupants could have been reduced by at least one-third.

This first nationwide poll of seat belt use was conducted during May and June in 47 States and the District of Columbia in connection with the National Vehicle Safety-Check program. More than 60 percent of participating communities and NADA dealer members reported results of their surveys. A similar poll is planned for 1962 and subsequent years to provide continuous information.

Advance information on results of the seat belt poll were presented to President Kennedy and referred to in his recent letter to Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn, President, General Federation of Women's Clubs. The President commended the Federation on their "Women's Crusade for Seat Belts," cosponsored by the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee.

#### THE 1961 NATIONWIDE POLL OF SEAT BELT INSTALLATION AND USE, COMPILED BY AUTO INDUSTRIES HIGHWAY SAFETY COMMITTEE

Installation, 3.3 percent.

Total vehicles included in seat belt poll, 757,164.

Total vehicles having seat belts, 24,897.

Use: 73 percent of the drivers of the 24,897 vehicles equipped with seat belts responded to the following questions regarding seat belt use:

1. Always use seat belt, 34.5 percent.
2. Use on long trips only, 37.3 percent.
3. Seldom use seat belt, 29.4 percent.

### Johnson's Achievements

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. IKARD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared a day

or so in one of the leading newspapers in my congressional district, the Wichita Falls Record News. This editorial is so timely, and so much to the point with regard to the recent activities of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, that I want to make this editorial available to the Members of Congress and others. The editorial sets out in graphic detail the invaluable assistance in our foreign policy program which has been and is being rendered to his country by this great Texan and most distinguished American statesman.

#### JOHNSON'S ACHIEVEMENTS

It takes an effort to recall the surprise which greeted LYNDON JOHNSON's unexpected acceptance last year of the No. 2 spot on the Democratic presidential ticket. Here was a man actually contemplating giving up the power of his position as majority leader in the Senate for the somewhat less than vital duties of Vice President.

JOHNSON, to be sure, played it shrewdly like the professional he is by running for reelection to the Senate simultaneously in his home State of Texas. But to some, this bifurcation of his appeal to the voters made his complete political retirement look even more like a distinct possibility.

It takes an effort to recall this because JOHNSON has been treading in anything but the backwaters of the Vice Presidency for the past 8 months. He has been in the swim of Government in a vigorous fashion. And most of this effort has been in unfamiliar international waters, to stretch the metaphor as far as it will go.

As President Kennedy's personal envoy, he has been to Geneva, Africa, the Philippines, Formosa, Japan, Thailand, Vietnam, Pakistan, India, and most recently, Berlin. The value of these trips to the President should not be understated.

Like other areas of the Constitution, what is not said about the Vice President is more important than the few duties specified. Yet only in recent years, especially during Richard Nixon's tenure, has the Office become anything more than an honorary sinecure for the heir apparent, potentially significant though it be.

Vice President JOHNSON's trip to Berlin may be viewed chiefly as a boost to the morale of the West Berliners, and in that respect it apparently was a successful maneuver. But another point is of overriding importance.

At one time, it would have been the peripatetic John Foster Dulles hopping on the plane to Berlin. But it was not the Secretary of State, it was the Vice President—the second in line—who went to that city the other day.

That fact is not lost on the Berliners, nor on others, who have never viewed the office of the U.S. Vice President with the disdain that has been bred among ourselves by familiarity with this aspect of our constitutional system—at least, as it once was.

The Vice President may be developing into something new on the American scene—Prime Minister and Plenipotentiary for Foreign Affairs. This would be much more than errand boy and much less than President, yet would be a unique and important position all its own. It could handle certain functions, such as a prestige visit to a foreign land, less easily carried out by the President or the Secretary of State, while freeing them for concentration on other facets of foreign policy.

This, Vice President JOHNSON seems already to have done in large measure. At the same time, he has been sharpening his knowledge of international political currents, both overall and in particular areas of the world.

This firsthand experience being gained by the Vice President certainly will not be counted superfluous in the remaining 3 years of the administration.

### Tribute to the Significance of Corn in American Life

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, early in the 1st session of the 86th Congress, there occurred a spirited colloquy among Members of this body on the subject of selecting a national flower. At that time the esteemed senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] held forth in eloquent and persuasive terms in favor of corn.

Without associating myself as a partisan in the cause of my good friend from Illinois, I would draw attention to some comments by notable Americans on the significance of corn in our national life which have been compiled by Miss Margo Cairns, a lady who has zealously devoted much time and energy to the effort of having the corn tassel adopted as a national symbol.

The nutritional importance of corn cannot be overemphasized. But I would also note that it was one of the first symbols adopted for some of the decorative motifs on the columns of this Capitol Building—the appropriateness of this choice having been observed by some irreverent individuals in relation to comments which are occasionally uttered in these legislative Chambers.

In the form of cereal grain, flour, and also in its more rarified or distilled form, corn has become an integral part of American life; it has sustained our physical life and enriched our language and folklore. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the comments on corn compiled by Miss Margo Cairns.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WHAT THEY SAY—COLLECTED COMMENTS ON CORN

Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president, Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge: "This Nation could not have fed itself through the years had it not been for maize, Indian corn."

"More than any other bloom in the bounty of God's garden—the corn tassel exemplifies the food by which America under our free system has been fed."

"May the means come to make this essential blossom the symbol of America both fed and free."

Gov. Luther H. Hodges, now U.S. Secretary of Commerce: "In order to provide North Carolinians with an opportunity to acknowledge the economic and traditional significance of a truly southern food product, the State will observe Cornbread Week during the period of October 5–11."

"Cornbread has long occupied an important place in North Carolina and the South. From our earliest days it has been a basic



ingredient in our region's worldwide reputation for culinary excellence. In infinite varieties—from hoe cake to spoonbread—the tasty and nutritious products of cornmeal are a delightful part of our way of life.

"Cornbread also occupies an important place in the economic life of North Carolina. Seed dealers, farmers, millers, and retailers all owe a substantial part of their livelihood to the production and marketing of corn and corn products.

"In recognition of the many benefits—tangible and intangible—derived from cornbread, I am glad to designate the week of October 5-11, 1958, as Cornbread Week in North Carolina."

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, May 11, 1961: "Corn symbolizes American abundance. It connotes the gratitude we have for its indispensable presence in the days of our ancestors' need, our present magnificent productive capacity, and the past, present, and future bounty our citizens have furnished to hungry peoples all over the world. It is a fitting symbol of our country in the plant world.

"I believe that the importance of corn both in our past history and in our society today clearly calls upon us to recognize this useful plant by making its golden corn tassel our national floral emblem. I am proud to introduce the golden corn tassel resolution for this purpose."

Congressman WALTER H. JUDD: "All Americans must know the story of the struggles for life by the early settlers of Jamestown and Plymouth and that it was corn, America's native plant that fed and sustained them. Perhaps not all Americans know that it was corn that saved starving Russians in the famine of the 1920's.

"Today this same American plant is feeding hungry peoples in many overpopulated lands. Corn has become the U.S. ambassador of good will around the globe.

Herschel D. Newsom, master, 1956: "The national grange, by action of its delegate body, favors the corn tassel as our national floral emblem. The resolution establishing this policy, and adopted by our delegate body, reads as follows:

"We recommend that the Congress enact legislation to declare the corn tassel our national floral emblem—corn being symbolic of the agriculture of our 48 States, native to our soil, and the object of cultivation for centuries—both by the red man and the farmer of today."

Wheeler McMillen, vice president, Farm Journal, Philadelphia: "It would take 11 tables stretching from San Francisco to New York to seat 180 million Americans for one single meal. We consume 540 million meals every day with little worry as to where the food is coming from.

Dorothy Giles, author, "Singing Valleys": "Corn is bread and ham and eggs and milk and cream and cheese. Corn is sugar and starch. Corn is oil and wine. Corn is clothing for men's bodies and shelter above their heads. Corn is life. Its life is the life of men.

"To us, in America, it is the strength of our past, the power of our present, the security of our future. For corn is the symbol of American democracy. And the story of corn is the story of the American people."

Harriet Simpson Arnow, author, "Seed-time on the Cumberland": "It is impossible to overestimate the importance of corn in the settlement of America. Corn was not only a proved and mighty plant of a growth so rapid it could lift itself above the weeds, but it could be planted with a hoe or grubbing hoe in ground too filled with roots and stumps for a plow to make a planting furrow. Another advantage of corn was that it would grow into a tall but sturdy plant able to hold its ears well out of reach of turkeys or raccoons, but down-hanging and

so well wrapped no damage could come from rain or snow and the smaller birds.

"There was, too, something kind and proud and free about the corn, big stuff a man could walk among, and reach his arms for the ears, 6 feet above the ground on 14-foot stalks. It grew in a wide variety of soils, and would yield at least something for bread on poor ground in a dry year.

"Travelers from Europe commented much on the American grain that was 'neither sown nor reaped.'"

Carl Sandburg, Flat Rock, N.C.: "All my life I have enjoyed watching corn grow, with something of wonder about how the stalk slowly rises from the ground and eventuates into the ripening ear with its brown silk. Now I find myself having added wonder about what happens and why it happens underground when the seed of corn is planted."

Dr. George D. Scarseth, director of research, West Lafayette, Ind.:

"Congratulations on your deep wisdom and understanding in seeing a great American character in the corn plant. Your suggestion that the corn tassel be selected as our national floral emblem is most appropriate.

"What can be a revelation more beautiful to the glory of God than the mechanism and the magic that takes place in a growing plant where the little balls of green chloroplasts race one another inside the cytoplasm, or juices of the cells of a green leaf? These are working to capture the sunshine some 90 million or more miles away and convert it into new life here on earth.

"The corn is one plant that captures more solar energy than any of our farm crops, and it has such a marvelous physiological mechanism in reproducing itself; in this the corn tassel is one of the keystones.

"We Americans have so much to live with and yet we hardly recognize that we have more to live for. So here's to you in your effort to make the corn tassel our national floral emblem."

Henry A. Wallace, former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture:

"A lovely flower for a living room is one thing; a floral emblem symbolizing a great nation is quite another."

Mrs. Julia Proctor White, educator, Peoria, Ill.: "A national floral emblem is not a thing of unrelated, arbitrary choice. To be truly symbolic it must have been interwoven with the story of the land and the people, and its associations with them must be potent and enduring. Our stately maize, the golden corn, is the one plant we have which amply fulfills these requirements.

"The corn tassel, flowering at the tip of its tall stalk, is in itself a symbol of the whole plant and thus doubly a symbol of the United States."

Mrs. Gertrude Stevenson, Minneapolis, Minn.: "A floral symbol must have more than beauty; though it must have that, it certainly must have a great deal more. It must have meaning—sacred and deep. It must be both subtle and evident. It must have history behind it and promise before it. It must awaken thanksgiving and continuity and reverence and faith. The corn tassel is the symbol of the only thing that grows that has all of this."

Val Bjornson, Minnesota state treasurer: "Scoffers, biased journalists, those who always look for some hidden selfish motive, are charmed and challenged by Miss Cairns' story of a plant cultivated by the red man for centuries before the white man came to our hemisphere, a plant native to our soil, symbolic of our agriculture, and, through its countless byproducts, of our industry."

The Professional Writers Club, Washington, D.C.: "The fabulous story of corn was unveiled for the delighted members in an address by Miss Margo Cairns supported by color motion pictures at the January 1961

meeting. She traced the history of corn from some secluded valley in the Andes, at least 10,000 years ago, to the fabulous fields of hybrid corn in our Western States today. Christopher Columbus found it in the Caribbean, the Pilgrims found it in New England, the Indians had used it for hundreds of years before the Europeans arrived, and the Incas had sculptured cornfields in gold, just to mention a few of her revelations."

### With One Hand Tied

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are considering authorizations and appropriations for extended foreign aid as well as new social programs, I think we can well afford to listen to the following advice of Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

#### WITH ONE HAND TIED

The boast, "I could lick him with one hand tied behind my back," is seldom put to the test in the boxing ring. But it now appears that we are planning to attempt this foolhardy stunt in the international arena.

The Berlin crisis is a dangerous challenge and we should be prepared to stand firm with both hands free in case we are forced to defend ourselves. However, administration statements and congressional action seem to indicate that we are expected to engage in an extremely costly arms buildup and at the same time carry the crushing load of multi-billion-dollar welfare state divide the wealth schemes.

Congress is asked to appropriate millions for the youth corps, hundreds of millions for distressed areas, a billion for Federal aid to education, assistance to foreign nations at the rate of 4 billion per year and more billions for farm program losses.

We are asked to support subsidies for private housing construction, grants to cities for slum clearance and sewage disposal plants, socialized medicine, and increased unemployment and welfare payments.

The result—a huge Federal deficit, a new high for the national debt, almost certain increases in income tax rates, new threats of inflation and a dangerous balance-of-payments situation. In other words, business as usual regardless of international dangers.

If we are to present a strong front in the cold war and be adequately prepared for worse developments, we must get our financial house in order. The successful prosecution of a long struggle, either hot or cold, will depend upon a high degree of citizen morale based on confidence in our Government.

Irresponsible Government spending, excessive taxation that discourages saving and investment, liberal welfare, and subsidy payments based on the "big brother" sharing idea rather than need, the something-for-nothing philosophy—these are the seeds that grow to destroy morale and sap the strength of a nation.

President Kennedy merits the support of every American in his courageous stand against the threat of the Soviets in Berlin. His request for manpower, money, and machines is being granted promptly. His call for sacrifice by all citizens will be accepted in good faith—providing the administration, the Congress, and the Washington



political bureaucracy are also willing to sacrifice.

The sacrifice we have a right to expect from the administration leadership is an indefinite suspension of the torrent of lavish spending proposals that have been flowing from the White House to Capitol Hill.

We are willing to ask, "What can we do for America," but the administration and the Congress must demonstrate their good faith by halting the constant barrage of legislation that encourages all of us to more frequently ask, "What can America do for us?"

We need the strength and muscle that comes from placing responsibility on individuals and by insisting on an honest day's work for a full day's pay. Government policies that dull incentives to produce and encourage the indolent make us soft and vulnerable. The "business as usual" idea must go. Yes, Mr. President, we are with you and we can win, but not with one hand tied behind our back.

## A Defense of the Legislative Branch of Government

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. HUGH SCOTT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, September 1, 1961*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fact and Comment: A Kind Word for a Much-Maligned Species," written by Malcolm S. Forbes, and printed in Forbes magazine for September 1, 1961. This article contains a word of appreciation and consolation for us all. It is a defense of the legislative branch of Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT AND COMMENT: A KIND WORD FOR A MUCH-MALIGNED SPECIES  
(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

Along with mothers-in-law, Congressmen are America's favorite whipping boys. As the current session pushes toward adjournment, the usual chorus of gripes against Congressmen rises from a thousand typewriters and a thousand rostrums.

Take this matter of winding up the current session. There are those who have demanded that Congress stay in session until certain pet legislation has been passed. Others insist that it would be sheer folly for Congress to adjourn during the Berlin crisis. Yet some of the most vocal of these stay-in-Washington groups are the very ones who gripe when their Congressman is unavailable for local ribbon cuttings and complain that "the only time we ever see you around is at election time." So it goes. On the matter of adjournment, as in most other matters, the Congressman is likely to be damned if he does and damned if he doesn't.

At the risk of being shot at as un-American during this open season on our lawmakers, I'd like to defend the much-maligned Congressmen. Yes, all of them. Even that handful who are so benighted and willful as to fail to see things my way.

I'll defend, for example, the mail weighers. This group, much scorned by high-minded, do-gooders, actually performs a rather useful

function in our society. The mail watchers, those sensitive souls, have but one conviction: the importance of their own reelection. About burning issues, expect no firm expressions of opinions from them. To do may be to die if they decide to reason why on a legislative hot potato. They weigh, not the issue, but the mail.

Perhaps this type of Congressman is not exactly a social scientist's idea of what the Founding Fathers had in mind for Congress. But the stubborn fact is that they perform a valuable function all the same. No scientist has yet devised a seismograph more sensitive than a Congressman holding up a wet finger into the political winds. No rhapsodic rhetoric about ideals or visions of sugarcorn will garner their vote—unless it looks like most of the "folks back home" have been moved, too—and first. In short, the mailwatcher, however timid his character, plays a rather important part in making representative government really representative.

In further defense of our legislative branch, I'd like to mention an even larger group. This sizable majority of representatives spends month after month trying to figure out what they think may be best for the country by the way of a new law or no new law. These misguided fellows aren't obliging enough to accept my opinion—sometimes not even yours. They've even indicated our personal opinion may be selfishly motivated, that there may be two sides to the issue. These fellows may even listen to those who disagree with us.

So they go on and do all sorts of foolish things for a good many hours after any sensible man has gone home from work. They hold committee hearings, public and private. They pass hours listening to visiting constituents. They even seem to spend a lot of time answering their mail and looking into, firsthand, some of the operations of Government for which the committees they belong to are responsible.

Taking into account all three categories of Congressmen—the stubborn, the seismographers and the bunch we were just talking about—it is sort of a wonder anything good gets done by them. Yet it does. That's why I wanted to take time out from the good old American sport of Congressmen sniping to say a word on behalf of our lawmakers.

## Correcting a Table Listing Accelerated Depreciation Granted Certain Investor-Owned Electric Utilities

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, September 1, 1961*

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on August 7 there was inserted in the RECORD by our colleague from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, a table under "Appendix A—Continued," on page 13759. This table is alleged to set out the amount of accelerated depreciation granted commercial electric utilities from the beginning of the program in 1950 through September 15, 1959, with estimated interest-free loans and subsidy benefits by company. I do not note in the remarks by Mr. HOLIFIELD accompanying this table the source of his information, but one company listed was the Kansas Power & Light Co.

doing business in Kansas with headquarters in Topeka. This Kansas company takes exception to the validity of Mr. HOLIFIELD's figures and requested that I so correct the table in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day. Pursuant to that request, I am including a letter from Mr. William L. Perdue, a representative of the Kansas Power & Light Co:

THE KANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO.,  
Topeka, Kans., August 17, 1961.

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: We note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—House of August 7 (p. 13759) a table which purports to list the amount of accelerated depreciation granted certain investor-owned electric utilities.

We cannot answer for the validity of those figures pertaining to other companies. In the case of our own, however, the information given is in error.

In the first place, the figures are not for accelerated depreciation, but for accelerated amortization. In the second place, the amount indicated for Kansas Power & Light Co. should be \$7,151,968 instead of the \$25,252,000 shown on the table.

We point this out to you in case this matter comes up for discussion again.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. PERDUE.

## Fish Farming in Arkansas

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, September 1, 1961*

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an interesting article concerning fish farming in Arkansas appeared in the August issue of the Rice Journal. This new type of farming has great potential for my State and many other areas throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH FARMING IS GOOD POTENTIAL IN ARKANSAS RICE AREAS  
(By Mary Louise Wright)

With the help of extensive research, aquaculture, one of Arkansas' newest and most unique industries appears to be on its way to becoming a giant in the State's economic picture.

It promises a better living for many farmers and additional employment and income in such allied industries as processing, packing and marketing.

Begun with the accidental discovery less than 10 years ago that commercial fish production was possible in conjunction with rice farming, what started out as an incidental operation offers also valuable secondary benefits such as soil and water conservation, increased rice crop yields and new recreational facilities.

Since the modest beginning, more than 300 Arkansas farmers have been licensed to raise fish on their rice lands. However, the present potential has not been the story long,



for until recently, pioneers in the new venture have done their fish raising by trial and error methods with little benefit of research, and their results have not been too gratifying.

Some farmers during the experimental years have made small profits from sales of fish, rotated with rice, and have increased their rice yields, without fertilizing, or by using less fertilizer following crops of fish than they would have otherwise. But the larger number of them who have tried to raise fish in reservoirs adjacent to streams from which they have pumped water infested with all types of fish, who have put their water in natural bogs, or who have stocked with new fish in areas already infested with trash fish and parasites have found their methods both expensive and discouraging.

But the cooperative efforts of the farmers with State and Federal agencies have stimulated and provided valuable research, especially during the past year or so, which is now resulting in more scientific practices with increasingly better results in prospect.

"Until now many of our farmers have found harvesting of fish more expensive than anticipated," said Arkansas County Agent Leamon Looney, who works with perhaps more fish farmers than any other county agent because there are more licensed fish farmers in Arkansas County than in any other in the State.

The agent added that a lot of farmers had become discouraged in the enterprise because of their haphazard methods of reservoir construction, draining and harvesting of fish crops, and in not knowing how to get rid of trash fish. In a number of the fish farming projects, trash fish populated the reservoirs fast and in great numbers, and cannibal fish ate many of the more desirable species, or the species with which the farmer stocked his acres.

"In this area we are finding it more profitable to construct reservoirs where land can be rotated with rice," Looney said. "However, it is not economically feasible to rotate every year. Fish should be raised for 2 or 3 years, and then rice 2 or 3. And of course, planning must go into the construction of the reservoirs, looking toward the harvests, and also in stocking them with desirable species of fish."

He explained a 2-year method under the fish-rice rotation plan now being used by some of the local farmers:

Brood buffalo stock are placed in the early spring into two one-fourth-acre plots at the rate of 500 to 600 per plot. When the temperature reaches 65°, the brood stock is placed in three one-half-acre spawning ponds and left there approximately 2 months. Then the fish are transferred into two 5-acre ponds and left until they are 5 to 8 inches long, which is usually in the fall. Fifty catfish 5 to 10 inches long are stocked per acre along with the buffalo fingerlings.

The second spring, 50 bass per acre could be added to the buffalo and catfish stock. Harvest could be made at the end of the second year, when the buffalo weigh between 6 and 8 pounds, the catfish between 2 and 4 pounds.

Fall harvest, the agent suggested, is best from the price standpoint, because it is usually then that the catch by commercial river fishermen is low.

"Some of our farmers are finding, however, that they can make more money by stocking their reservoirs and selling fishing rights to sportsmen or opening the reservoirs for commercial fishing," Looney said, and he added that it appeared to be the best prospect moneywise until further research was done.

In rotating fish with rice crops, though, there are other values which the agent pointed out. The fish add to the fertility of the soil, and flooding for fish is a means of eradicating undesirable grasses and weeds from rice cropland.

Arkansas delta lands have around 100,000 acres capable of producing fish commercially within 2 or 3 years. Only about one-fifth of that acreage is being used for that purpose at the present, but fish raising has progressed to the extent that a modern processing, freezing, and cold storage plant is in operation at Dumas in Desha County, and Arkansas and her sister States in the Mississippi River Delta are said to have a potential for an ultimate production of billions of pounds of nutritionally valuable fish.

In the several States, approximately 2 million acres are encompassed in the area capable of producing 1,000 to 10,000 pounds per acre annually. While this staggering production is not expected to be reached in the next few years, it does provide a valuable reserve for the needs of future generations.

Present average is less than 200 pounds of fish per acre, and production, also, will have to be increased for a profitable operation, along with more efficient harvesting methods.

But progress is being made rapidly, and working hand in hand in the development of the new industry are Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, the University of Arkansas and its industrial research and extension services, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Arkansas Game and Fish Commission research and experimentation during the past 2 years, with Andrew Hulsey, chief of the commission's fisheries division, and Joe Hogan of the State fish hatchery at Lonoke working closely with fish farmers on a treatment for control of parasites that commonly infest fish, have successfully used benzene hexachloride, a common ingredient in cotton insect poison, in ridding ponds of parasites, and a free booklet on the subject can be had by writing either the Game and Fish Commission, Little Rock, or Mr. Hogan, Lonoke.

Another big step in the research field is the installation of a new fish farming experiment station adjacent to Arkansas Rice Branch Experiment Station east of Stuttgart and a substation at Kelso this summer. The Stuttgart station will have a staff of more than a dozen, headed by Dr. James Stevenson. While construction will not be completed until fall, it opened on July 24.

A Department of Interior appropriations bill OK'd by the Senate Appropriations Committee in June earmarks \$179,000 for the research work—\$114,000 of that amount to go to the fish farming station at Stuttgart and Kelso substation, and \$65,000 to be allotted to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for marketing research and other assistance to the fish farming industry, headquartered at Dumas and directed by Leo J. Sullivan.

Roy Prewitt, a Little Rock lawyer and former State welfare commissioner who moved to a farm in Lonoke County to become one of the pioneers in the business, says that the fish farming industry already brings in at least \$1½ million new money from the outside annually. Arkansas farm-raised fish are being shipped by air all over the world.

And a million pounds of fish a year, if the markets can be found for them, is in the foreseeable future for the State through its aquaculture program.

## Government Operated Shipyards Flourish While Private Yards Diminish

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in 1954, my good friend from California, Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY, made the following statement before the House Committee on Government Operations:

I don't think it is at all the desire of the military of this country to take over private business. I don't think there is any design in the Defense Department or any branch in the military to take over private business or take over or run this country on a military basis. But I do say that unconsciously the military can expand its operations to such an extent that some day we might suddenly find that they are engaged in so many commercial activities that they are throttling private business, and we could just as easily slip into a military system without being aware of what was happening or without any design to have it happen as other countries have in the past.

The wisdom of Mr. SHELLEY's words is genuinely and lastingly recognized. However, when one reads in the public press that the tax-free, high-cost naval shipyards are increasing their payrolls while tax-producing, low-cost privately owned shipyards are laying off workers, it is hard to believe that the military is not "throttling private business." But that is exactly what is taking place in what is supposed to be a free competitive enterprise way of life. Today, where naval ship work is concerned, there are twice as many people employed in the naval shipyards than in the private yards.

Marine News magazine, in its August issue, puts this situation in clear focus in a provocative editorial entitled "It Doesn't Make Sense," which, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE (By Wilber W. Young)

In round figures the World War II U.S. Navy Fleet was comprised of 10,000 fighting ships. To support that fleet there were 11 naval shipyards. Now, 16 years later after the end of the war, the fleet has shrunk to 817 ships, but the same 11 naval shipyards remain active and are employing steady labor. In the last 10 years, more than 20 private shipyards have gone out of business for lack of work. This situation does not make sense.

We are not unmindful of the Navy's long range requirements for maintaining the fleet in readiness to meet any emergency. Nor of its need for constantly activated shipbuilding and ship repair facilities especially in the light of world conditions today. The problems confronting the Department of the Navy and the Bureau of Ships are of such



enormity that any criticism short of positive, constructive suggestion would constitute a disservice to national security.

In that spirit we point to the progressive shrinkage of private shipbuilding facilities while the Navy is admittedly trying to get "more mileage out of its appropriated dollars" for construction, repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels. The Navy is quoted as having stated that more than \$40 million can be saved through construction of one aircraft carrier in a private shipyard instead of in a Navy yard. Furthermore, top Navy officials have conceded in recent hearings before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by Congressman GEORGE H. MAHON of Texas, that, "we could, in today's market, buy ships cheaper privately than we can in naval shipyards" . . . also at the same time they revealed that costs of ship work done by Navy yards are 8 percent to 15 percent higher than in private yards.

Navy ship work (80 percent of all repairs, alterations, and conversions) is allocated to naval yards on the basis of maintaining steady employment in these tax-exempt, high-cost facilities while thousands of skilled workers in private shipyards face unemployment and the future of U.S. shipbuilding and ship repairing industries is in jeopardy. This Federal competition is a constant drain on the Public Treasury and it is a glaring contradiction of the philosophy of free enterprise, costing taxpayers millions of extra defense dollars.

Against such a background there is the ever-present threat of an emergency. And when the worst happens, suddenly the Government turns to private industry for the necessities that are vital to national survival. Thanks to the loyal, fighting patriotism of the industrial community as a whole they have always delivered the goods when the chips were down. For example, during World War II the base facilities of private shipyards were expanded 1,300 percent to meet the Navy's requirements in excess of its capacity, which, by the way, was increased only 300 percent above the normal base during the same period. At the close of hostilities, the Navy, as is its custom, just as suddenly, again became self-sufficient and, through its shortsighted and self-serving policy of holding naval shipyard facilities at normal level, regardless of the cost, has materially contributed to the present plight of private shipyards.

It is neither necessary nor wise to accept the waste of preparedness and war as an unmitigated verity. This is an area in which both peacetime and wartime waste can be meliorated by spreading the work load more economically in peaceful years. Such a policy would keep the ship construction and repair yards at a level of prosperity and readiness from which they could spring into full production faster and at far less cost to taxpayers.

President Kennedy has said that we are living in an age of change in which the American people must put forth their best efforts in meeting present challenges. Also in that and every other sense the private shipbuilding and ship-repairing industries pledge their best efforts to the Government to insure that the United States Navy will always be the best in the world. Is the Navy aware of that pledge?

Twenty defunct shipyards will have great difficulty in fulfilling the pledge that their industry is reputed to have made and many yards now struggling to stay in business would welcome some patronage by the Navy.

The Secretary of Defense has appointed a special committee to review operations at many military establishments, including naval shipyards, to determine those which could properly and economically be reduced without hindrance to national security. This is a step in the right direction. The

findings and recommendations of the committee will be awaited with great interest in many quarters.

The Shipbuilders Council of America has launched a program under the direction of the Council's vice president, Edwin M. Hood, designed to bring all of these problems into sharp focus and to promote closer cooperation between the Navy and private shipyards. "When all of the facts are gathered and evaluated," said Mr. Hood, "we have no fears that our defense officials will recognize the wisdom of placing greater reliance on the tax-producing, low-cost private shipyards throughout the country."

To that we say "Amen."

### A Dairy Research Center

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, I introduced bill S. 2414 for establishing a dairy research center to find new industrial and commercial uses for dairy products.

I am delighted to report that there has been widespread interests and enthusiasm for this approach to better utilizing our dairy resources to serve the American people.

On August 29, the Green Bay Gazette, of Green Bay, Wis., published a splendid article on the merits of such a laboratory. Presenting good solid reasons why Congress should move ahead on this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, is proposing legislation to establish a dairy research center at Madison. The purpose, he says, is to find new ways to utilize dairy products for commercial-industrial uses.

He points out that over the years we have built a huge dairy industry for the production of milk, cheese, butter, ice cream and other foods for human consumption. He thinks now, however, that we need "Columbus-type researchers" to discover new industrial and commercial uses for milk, cheese, butter, and other dairy items.

The need for such an undertaking has been clear to many people for a long time. However, Congress has been slow to act probably because the dairy industry is centered largely in a very few States and thus does not have the broad appeal necessary to get Federal legislation.

However, R. E. Hodgson, president of the American Dairy Science Association, said recently in a speech in Wisconsin that the declining acceptance of milk and milk products is one of the top problems facing the dairy industry. He said there has been an increase in the use of nonfat solids in milk and a decrease in fat consumption. The decrease in the use of butterfat has been due in part to the development of competitive fats and also in part to the advice of doctors to many persons to avoid animal fats. More generally, however, the widespread slenderizing programs followed by

many persons have reduced the consumption of butter and butterfat in cream and in rich desserts made from dairy products.

Senator WILEY is proposing that the Federal Government put up the research center and provide facilities and equipment to search for new ways to utilize dairy products and their constituent parts for new purposes. He believes that this would be a tremendous boon, not only to the dairy industry, but also to the economy of the Nation. We think the Senator is absolutely right and that such an investment by Congress would not be inflationary because it would add to the Nation's prosperity generally and enrich all of the people to some extent.

Address by Vice Adm. J. S. Thach, U.S. Navy, to Officers and Men of U.S.S. "Yorktown"

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the stirring remarks by Vice Adm. J. S. Thach, U.S. Navy, commander of the Antisubmarine Warfare Forces of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, aboard the U.S.S. *Yorktown*, on August 5, 1961. The remarks were addressed to the officers and men of the Antisubmarine Warfare Forces.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE ADM. J. S. THACH, U.S. NAVY, COMMANDER ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE FORCES, U.S. PACIFIC FLEET ABOARD THE U.S.S. "YORKTOWN," AUGUST 5, 1961

First, I want to welcome the officers and men of this splendid hunter-killer group. You are here in Hawaiian waters for an operational readiness evaluation. This is not going to be easy. I don't want it to be. This will be a test of your stamina, as well as your skill as a team before you deploy to the forward areas of freedom in the western Pacific.

You are here to demonstrate your readiness and readiness is really needed in today's tension-filled world.

This is a team test of ships, submarines, naval airpower, but, above all, of men working together to carry out your mission and mine—antisubmarine warfare.

Pearl Harbor is far from Berlin—far from Berlin geographically—and yet we in the Pacific are most mindful of the global implication of today's Berlin crisis. Indeed, we are keenly aware also of the modern submarine threat that can confront us as a new crisis compels us to consider carefully our readiness and take a hard look at our capability to contribute.

Sophisticated systems in the submarines today show a trend toward emphasis on quality rather than quantity. This is true not only in our Navy but in all the other navies of the world. The threat of modern submarines has increased a great deal. As a result, today fewer submarines can pose a far more potent threat than was the case several years ago.

The need for modernity in the ASW Forces that must oppose the new nuclear submarine is manifestly clear. We too must capitalize on the revolutionary progress of this past



decade of accomplishment to keep pace. We can't afford not to catch up with the modern submarines that may oppose us.

As we prepare to meet this modern threat we realize that effective ASW provides a rock bed foundation for control of the seas. Anti-submarine warfare is a common strategic denominator of all types of conflict. It covers the broad spectrum of all contingencies—from limited through general wars.

Just because submarines have not been used in a limited war in the past is no reason to be complacent and assume that they will not be used in the next one. For example, in 1950 at the time of our limited war in Korea, Red China had no submarines. But today, they have the fourth largest submarine fleet in the world. With more and more countries acquiring submarines a serious and perhaps quite confusing situation could arise by a country using submarines converted in a limited war so that we would never know which country's submarines were involved. This would pose the perplexing problem: "Who fired the torpedo—or missile?"

In testing our readiness naturally we must consider the spectacular American achievements in submarines capability.

The Polaris system at sea, the product of revolutionary technological progress through scientific accomplishment, makes crystal clear the magnitude of our future challenge. Modern mobile submarine hunting forces must meet this growing threat responsibly—if we would deter convincingly.

Our hunter killer forces need nuclear power for sustained mobility as they search for submarines. They need nuclear submarines as members of their tri-dimensional team effort. Longer range detection systems are needed to reach out, and modern weapons of swift reaction are needed for fast decisions in the rough-and-ready game we play. Positive and quick kill capability is needed to win.

All of us have found that ASW is a tough job. It is not glamorous. ASW is a 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week task. But it is rewarding work for those who accept the challenge.

This is a challenge of leadership and morale, an acid test of character and conviction. Our success or failure in ASW hinges on the determination and strength of people like you who work on ASW around the clock. That is why I have said so many times that it takes dedicated men to be good in ASW. We can seek the stars and moon in space but it is here on earth the test will come and the decision made as to whether we will remain free to do these things. This you men will decide by your performance, by how well you handle the weapons and equipment our country is providing.

Recently our President talked to the Nation. He told of the seriousness of the Berlin situation. He also told us what we must do to defend freedom.

There were a thousand and one things that he could have mentioned. He only had time to talk of a few.

But he did talk about ASW.

This fact is important to us in our business. The entire Nation became aware of the urgency of our effort—the top flight importance of this task. The President provided an incentive to work harder. He focused world attention on ASW as a race in liquid space. As you can see I could talk all day about ASW; it is fascinating. But we are here today for a change of command. We in the Navy always participate in these ceremonies with mixed emotions.

Adm. Bill Stuart joined the ASW team as a hunter killer commander approximately a year ago. His dedicated efforts as well as his professional ability are reflected in the readiness of this force. Well done, Bill, we say aloha to you with sincere reluctance.

To Adm. Joe Cobb we extend a warm welcome and wish you well as you assume com-

mand of this fine group. Needless to say you arrive at a time when a premium is placed on combat ready ASW forces to meet the threats that confront us. Welcome to our ASW family of the Pacific.

I am confident you and your team will demonstrate the real readiness which is needed more today than ever before in our peacetime history.

### Apple Institute Views on Strength of American Agriculture

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call attention to an excellent and penetrating statement by Mr. James B. Moore, the executive vice president on the National Apple Institute, entitled "The Strength of American Agriculture."

Mr. Moore makes a point with which I heartily agree. He notes that our farm problem is one of overabundance, and that this is a much better situation to have to contend with than underabundance, as is the case in so many parts of the world. This does not mean we do not need to take vigorous steps to improve, update, and make less costly our basic farm programs. To the contrary, it is an affirmation of the strength and effectiveness of our free-enterprise system.

The apple industry can be proud of the fact that it has dealt realistically and firmly with its own market situation. Apple growers do not receive Government price supports, and they have not asked for them. What is more, they have on their own initiated many fine programs to expand the sales of their product.

Mr. President, I think this is a particularly thoughtful statement which Mr. Moore has written, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### THE STRENGTH OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Two gigantic forces are currently locked in a struggle for survival. These forces are popularly symbolized by the so-called East and West, or specifically the United States and her allies versus the Soviet Union and her satellites. This struggle is referred to as the cold war, a struggle for men's minds, where economics and political philosophy are the major battlefields. It seems that in this struggle we have overlooked the most outstanding story of the value of our free economic system to all peoples, in not adequately publicizing the fantastic success story of American agriculture.

We, in this country, gnash our teeth and wall about the problems of American agriculture, and yet when we analyze this problem, it always boils down to the fact that we are just too efficient. This is a problem of surplus in a world where the mass of human beings live their lives at the brink of starvation. There can be no more remarkable story of the vitality and value of the free enterprise system than this story of

American agriculture. The ability to feed the Nation and then go on to create an economic problem through overabundance is absolutely fantastic in view of world food supply conditions. A really significant part of this story is that the vast majority of our governmental activities in the agricultural area are concerned with reducing, eliminating, utilizing, storing, and purchasing surplus. This production is the result of freemen working as individuals on their own land with a profit motive. We contrast this with mandatory cooperatives on state-owned land, highly organized, dictatorially directed, unable in many parts of the world to produce enough food to provide for the most basic needs of the domestic populations.

During the past year there have been numerous reports of mass starvation, inadequate food supply and political turmoil created by underfed people coming out of Communist China. Factually we know that the Chinese Communists have arranged to purchase 235 million bushels of wheat and barley to sustain the meager diet of their citizens. In a recent speech Premier Khrushchev severely criticized Soviet agricultural performance, which fell far short of predicted production.

Now pause to reflect upon these problems of Communist China and Soviet Russia. Translate them if you will into the physical and emotional anguish of parents unable to feed their children, of entire communities void of food, individuals such as you and I, multiplied into countless millions unable to provide themselves with the most basic human need, the very fuel of human energy—food. Bearing this very strongly in mind, reflect on the tremendous problem of American agriculture, overabundance. How completely odd that we are put on the run in defending our system of free enterprise in the face of such gross inefficiency by our competitors. There should be no race at all. We possess the means, the ability and the applied science capable of lifting the entire world out of the morass of economic and social depression so that all can live as freemen with not only the basic human needs but the surplus of leisure and culture which modern society demands.

Apple growers can be particularly proud of the fact that they have not only contributed to this national economic state of abundance but in addition have organized themselves voluntarily into State, regional, and national organizations which are engaged in promotion, research, education, and advertising. They are creating and enlarging their markets without the funds and control of Federal Government.

This activity is a visible living testimony to the fact that freemen who are socially mature enough to voluntarily organize themselves to cooperatively meet their common challenge can accomplish a great deal more than any governmental controlled mandatory society.

### The Eternal Woman

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, it was the pleasure of this body to hear a score and more eloquent tributes commemorating the passage of the 19th amendment to the Constitution of the United States in August 1920. I have nothing but praise for the think-



ing men of our generation who today accept and rejoice in the demonstrated capabilities of our lovely and gracious ladies of America.

Mr. Speaker, of all the praises bestowed by my distinguished colleagues, I heard none so well expressed as one written by a young man from Apple Springs, Tex. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Eternal Woman," by Travis C. Tullos, Jr., be reprinted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Groveton (Tex.) News]

#### THE ETERNAL WOMAN

Poets down through the ages have tried to describe her. Painters immemorial have struggled to catch her image on canvas. Lyricists have written many thousands of lines to melodious sounds with the prayer that their efforts would truly reflect the splendor of her charms, and she would be caught for all time in the harmony of music and words. Shakespeare wrote of Desdemona, Van Gogh stroked "The Naked Maha," and how about modern songs such as "Georgia," "Jeanie, With the Light Brown Hair," and "Maria." And the writers, of course, have tried their hand in such books as "Gone With the Wind." Most of us remember the personage of Scarlett O'Hara from that novel. But somewhere in my meanderings through these art works I have failed to find in every respect the key to the sort of person which would inspire such efforts.

I feel emphatically that I have met a few. Not many, just a few.

And yet, though personal contact has been limited, it is my observation that there is a certain unfathomable quality entrenched in each one of the delicate creatures. What is there, for instance, in the Mona Lisa smile? Sex appeal, you say. Naw, I think it's more than that. There is a sweet mystery, a web of frustrating unpronounced mystery. Maybe that is it. This could possibly be the strange aura that has caused many a young man to toss in his sleep at night (and I suspect some older ones too).

The concept of an eternal woman may sound glorified. And maybe it is. But somewhere in the personality of such an holy occurrence there does lie a seemingly indestructible force which defies the existence of death or suppression. It cries for the right to be recognized and appreciated for the rarity it is. Probably the worst punishment of a human nature that can be reaped upon a woman of this caliber is to not be thought of for what she really is. Unfortunately, this is the problem for most of them.

These women mature early in life. Both physically and mentally. Their wisdom usually, in many ways, exceeds that of their male brethren. One characteristic of prominence is the more liberal and understanding judgment they exercise at times of crisis. When a situation of great moment presents itself, they are tough as nails. It would be fair to assume that this ability is what helps to make them the tremendous mothers they are. They accept the burden of child-bearing with overwhelming fondness and love. This is their most unlimited faculty. Love. For children, for husband, for friends, and, even for chance acquaintances, but most of all for the first two. To a husband, or even a lover, she is the epitome of femininity. Affection is her vanguard. And beauty. The beauty of this unique and curious being is unsurpassable, but not in the Hollywood, glamour-girl fashion. No, this beauty of which I speak wells up from within. It flows like an artesian well, without ceasing or unnatural production. It hints at something mental as well as physical. The tide of it is never brooked. Take a blossom from

a magnolia, allow a drop of softest dew to fall, bathe both with an ember-soft glow of moonlight, and then lightly, just lightly, let a cool evening breeze caress them all. There is just a hint of what beauty lies at the depth of the eternal woman. The flowing lines of an appropriate red dress can achieve the same effect.

This is the eternal woman. Wise, profound in many ways, motherly, loving, unrelinquishingly desirable, colorful, durable, and excruciatingly proud. A foolish concept? Maybe so, maybe so.

### The American Credo

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in an age when it is so all-important to recognize and preserve each of our cherished freedoms, one of our foremost tasks becomes the job of knowing what it is in our heritage that we must perpetuate.

An excellent address on one aspect of this problem was recently delivered in Baltimore by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, former Governor of Maryland, at the national president's luncheon of the Jewish War Veterans Auxiliary. Because of the depth and importance of Mr. McKeldin's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the representative of the Freedoms Foundation my first duty today is to acknowledge with gratitude the helpful interest that the Ladies Auxiliary of the Jewish War Veterans has always taken in the work of the foundation. My second duty is to speak to you on a theme as familiar to you as any in the world, but which is not worn out by repetition, but is only carved more deeply upon our minds and hearts the oftener we consider it.

This theme is the "American Credo" as expressed by the Freedoms Foundation in its 17 enumerated rights. There is, I believe, an 18th right that might be added to that credo, although I suppose it need not be stated explicitly, since it is implied in all the others. Still, I propose to talk about it a little while.

This implied right is not easily stated in specific terms. The best I can do is to call it the right to recognize excellence wherever it may be found. You may think, because of the way I have stated it, that this is not much of a right anyhow, and it isn't denied; but a little reflection will convince you that you have been misled by my awkward words.

As a matter of fact, it inspires and gives value to all the other rights, and it is constantly denied or restricted almost everywhere in the world. For what gives value to freedom? What makes it worth having? We all know that to win it and keep it involves labor, peril and sacrifice, even to the sacrifice of life itself. Then what gives it this transcendent value? What is this freedom that is worth everything else in the world?

The word, of course, covers innumerable things. Merely being out of jail is freedom, of a sort, but we don't believe that that is what Jefferson meant when he listed "lib-

erty" among the three gifts with which the Creator has endowed mankind, and which, because they are gifts of the Creator, mortal man has no right to take away.

Perhaps the clearest definition is that of Lord Acton, called a historian, but really a great philosopher of history. He called true freedom liberty to pick and choose, among the countless things that claim our attention, those that are really excellent, rejecting those that merely seem to be desirable. The fact that a man may misuse this liberty is no excuse for depriving him of it. If he mistakes brass for gold, we may try to teach him better, but we must not deny his freedom of choice, for that is more valuable than gold.

Yet it is denied. All over the world it is constantly denied by one means or another, and that is why the battle to maintain freedom is never ending.

Let me illustrate the point by a very gross example. A few years ago, during the rule of the beast in Germany, the German people were subjected to a moral slavery worse than any fetters of iron. It came home to me early in the war when the son of one of my friends was killed in battle. The young man died like an officer and a gentleman, in the highest tradition of military service, and it was my privilege on meeting his father, to take off my hat and thank him for having produced a man who had added to the honor of our Nation.

But I could do that only because I am an American citizen and a freeman. Had I been a slave of the German dictator, I could not have done it. I should have had to suppress my tribute to valor because the valiant dead had worshipped God by a rite different from the one that I follow. He was a Jew.

When any man is deprived of the right to recognize, and rejoice in, and pay tribute to excellence, wherever it may be found, he is no longer a freeman; indeed, he is no longer a whole man. He is morally deformed, spiritually crippled; and though he may stride through the world with the tread of Caesar, attended by an army of sycophants, and spreading terror wherever he goes, he is but a poor thing. He has no liberty, he has only license, which is as counterfeit as a dollar stamped from lead.

Now let me repeat that I cited Hitler's Germany as a particularly gross example of what I meant. It is probably the worst example in modern times, but let us not delude ourselves that it is the only one. Let us not flatter ourselves that even in this land of freedom we are wholly guiltless of the same error. Whenever and wherever a fine deed is done and the man who does it is denied his due meed of praise on account of his race, or his religion, or on account of any extraneous circumstance, the right to recognize excellence is to that extent denied and the denial deprives the people concerned of their true freedom. Note that I say nothing of the man who has achieved excellence. He is usually accounted the victim of prejudice and injustice, but in point of fact he has suffered only a minor injury; the deeply hurt are those who have lost their freedom to recognize and to follow the good because they are in bondage, if not to some human dictator, then to some invisible, but powerful prejudice, or passion, or false tradition. They have lost the very essence of freedom, the thing that makes it more valuable than life itself.

More than that, when we Americans lose it, we are twice guilty—guilty first as regards ourselves, and also guilty as regards those whose heirs we are. For we are pledged to act otherwise. Don't think that only John Hancock and those who with him signed the document are bound by the Declaration of Independence. They were not acting on their own; they were acting as representatives, as agents, of all the American people, including their posterity.



Consider, then, the words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident . . . that all men are created equal . . . that they are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights . . . and to the support of this declaration we mutually pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Along with our liberty we inherited this pledge, and when we accepted the liberty, we accepted the pledge. We are bound by it, and if we repudiate it, we are perjured.

And as I am speaking to the mothers, wives, and daughters of Jewish war veterans, let me point out that the Jewish American is doubly bound. For he was pledged a long, long time before 1776. Read on the bell that announced the signing of the Declaration, and which was cast before independence was thought of, this inscription: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof." That command was not issued to the American colonists. It is from the Book of Leviticus, the law of the Jews. Again, the Prophet Isaiah, denouncing mere formalism, derided mere rites and ceremonies, including fasting, and continued, "Is not this the fast that I have chosen—to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke?"

"To undo the heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free"—that, said the Prophet of God, is the religion of the Jews, of which fasting is a mere outward token. In view of this, I find it nothing strange that so many Jews have made extraordinarily good Americans, from Haym Salomon, who gave his fortune during the Revolution, all through the years down to my friend's son who gave his life in the Second World War. They were undoing heavy burdens, they were letting the oppressed go free; and in so doing they were vindicating the inalienable rights with which the Creator has endowed all men.

It is a great inheritance, and at the same time it is a solemn bond. I believe that we should rejoice in the inheritance, and I believe that we should cultivate our children's pride in it. But even as it is great, so are we strictly bound to see that it shall pass to the generation that comes after us intact; and that means that we must not for a moment forget the bond that came with the inheritance.

Our land is a land of freedom, but only relatively so. We lead the nations, but that does not mean that we have attained the goal. It is still in the distance and there is many a long day's march before us, a march through dust and heat, possibly through peril and blood, before we reach it. But our fathers before us were still further away, yet they set out valiantly and continued faithfully. If we have inherited only the freedom they won, and not the faith and courage by which they won it, how shall we account ourselves their true sons?

And among all the countless races and creeds and conditions that make up this great Republic, it seems to me that the heirs of the promise to Abraham should be among the most reliable. So I think that the spirit of America has said, and will continue to say to the Jewish American the words of Adonijah to Jonathan: "Come in; for thou art a valiant man, and bringest good tidings."

### The Human Side of a Great Judge

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the creation of a better world, in which men

can seek and attempt to attain their aspirations and dreams in a climate of freedom, depends upon the establishment and execution of, adherence to, and respect for, a good system of laws.

At best, laws, not just rigid chains to bind the souls and lives of mankind, should be universally recognized codes of conduct that best serve the individual and society.

Justice, even under good laws, however, cannot be obtained unless administered by men of wisdom, good judgment, and a sensitivity for the rights of individuals and society.

Throughout our history, we, as a nation, have benefited from the service of such jurists.

As a unique example, I humbly pay homage to one such outstanding jurist, the late Judge Learned Hand. During his lifetime, he became one of the most admired, respected and revered judges in our history.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an article entitled "The Human Side of a Great Judge." Reflecting the philosophy which helped a great man to make an outstanding contribution to an improved judicial system in our country, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 30, 1961]

THE HUMAN SIDE OF A GREAT JUDGE—LEARNED HAND, THE FOREMOST JURIST OF HIS DAY, COULDN'T STAND PLATITUDES BUT HE WAS TOLERANT OF WEAKNESSES OF THE FLESH—HIS WRITINGS AT BEST WERE LITERATURE

For the last 20 years or so, any mention of "the great judge" was well understood by Americans without the addition of the name. Learned Hand was conceded to be our greatest living judge, in the line of the foremost jurists in our history: Marshall, Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo.

Great he was, not only as a lawyer but as a thinker, writer, patriot, democrat, humorist and human being, a retired judge of U.S. courts in New York, died August 18 at 89.

Two years ago, a lavish ceremony was held at the New York Federal courthouse on the occasion of Hand's 50th year on the bench. Responding to the many eulogies, the veteran jurist remarked that his life had been "uneventful, unadventurous, easy, safe and pleasant."

"Those five adjectives are inadequate and inaccurate," Justice Felix Frankfurter retorted. "I propose, instead, 'daring, romantic, antediluvian, sophisticated and lucky.'"

Yes, "romantic" undoubtedly would apply.

"When we were boys," Hand used to recall, "my cousin Augustus and I liked overnight camping in the Adirondacks. We would spend a month planning a single night in the woods, but the project appealed excessively to my romantic nature." (The late Augustus Noble Hand also became an outstanding Federal judge.)

#### JUDGE HAND ON LIBERTY

Learned Hand's writings at their best are literature. His best known composition is that which he read at an "I am an American" observance in 1944:

"What then is the spirit of liberty? I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith.

"The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs

their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but never quite forgotten: That there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

For less exalted subjects he displayed a lively sense of fun. In the 1920's the enormous success of the stage comedy, "Able's Irish Rose," inspired the writing of a play on a similar thesis, "The Cohens and the Kellys." The owners of "Able" brought suit on grounds of copyright violation, and the court ruled in favor of the defendant.

"There are but four characters common to both plays, the lovers and the fathers," he stated judicially. "The lovers are loving and fertile; that is really all that can be said of them, and anyone else is quite within his rights if he puts loving and fertile lovers in a play of his own."

#### HE KNEW THE FLESH IS WEAK

For weakness of the flesh, the stern jurist revealed a consistent tolerance. A woman from Europe had been refused citizenship because, according to the evidence, her unworthiness was revealed by moral laxity. The case was appealed to Judge Hand, who declared:

"A continued illicit relationship is not inevitably an index of bad moral character. A person may have a good moral character even though he has been delinquent upon occasion in the past; it is enough if he shows that he does not transgress the accepted moral canons more often than usual."

In a similar case the errant applicant was a 39-year-old bachelor.

"You wouldn't want your daughter to marry such a man," the government attorney told the judge, who was the father of three daughters.

"I wouldn't want her to marry a man of 39 who hadn't had the impulse," the court replied sharply.

His shifting and contrasting moods were relished by his colleagues and onlookers more than by the attorneys who argued before him. Deep in thought, he was riding the elevator to his office when a stranger told him, "Pardon me, Judge Hand, but I want to tell you how much I admire the opinion you delivered yesterday."

"Thank you very much," the jurist answered and smiled broadly. As he entered his office he shouted a hearty "Good morning, really a splendid morning" and told his clerk of the encounter with the stranger. For the next few minutes, from his chambers, he could be overheard whistling tunes from his beloved Gilbert and Sullivan. Then he sounded the buzzer for the clerk, who found him looking deeply contemplative.

"I cannot fathom," he said deliberately, "why I allowed myself to care what that fellow thought of my opinion."

#### NO PATIENCE WITH WINDBAGS

For lawyers who rambled or uttered platitudes, he had scant patience. He would interrupt them with cries of "Rubbish." Or "Enough, enough, I can't take any more." If an attorney would begin, "As the court is well aware," he would snap back: "We are aware of nothing—you are here to enlighten us." Of another windy debater he demanded: "May I inquire just what are you trying to tell us?"

In the writing of his more than 2,000 decisions he worked his staff as well as himself many hours overtime. He didn't mind if a clerk or stenographer brought along a sandwich and coffee, but he was death on chewing gum. A specimen of his dictation to a clerk might be: "Now, in relation to the appellants' rights in this maritime insurance—ah, ah, sonny, we've come to the parting of the ways. I can smell Spearmint again. Throw that gum away—the appellant's rights in this maritime insurance."



When prohibition was on the books, Judge Hand ruled that the enforcement of the 18th amendment applied to American ships on the high seas.

"Naturally, I have nothing to say about the wisdom of the amendment or the law," he said, "but, wise or not, one thing is clear, that a drink of whisky is as hurtful to health and morals outside as inside Ambrose light."

#### RULES OF THE GAME MUST BE OBSERVED

Some of Hand's really important decisions involved the Communist menace, which he recognized in 1950 when, in a 20,000-word decision, he affirmed the conviction of 11 American Communist leaders.

"The American Communist Party is a highly articulated, well contrived, far spread organization, numbering thousands of adherents, rigidly and ruthlessly disciplined, many of whom are infused with a passionate Utopian faith that is to redeem mankind.

"Our democracy, like any other, must meet that faith and that creed on the merits or it will perish; and we must not flinch at the challenge. Nevertheless we may insist that the rules of the game be observed; and the rules confine the conflict to weapons drawn from the universe of discourse."

Yes, the rules must be observed, he insisted again a few months later when he reversed the conviction of Judith Coplon on an espionage charge. "Her guilt is plain," he conceded, but found that the Government had not followed the rules: It had not obtained a warrant for her arrest and its gathering of evidence by illegal wiretaps was questionable.

#### UPHELD FREEDOM TO DISSENT

Judge Hand would not let himself be scared by ideological threat. In 1952, when the American anti-Communist hysteria was blowing gustily, he spoke up stoutly that "American democracy would be threatened by suppression of freedom to dissent, by the making of denunciations without evidence, and by loss of faith in the eventual supremacy of reason.

"Risk for risk," his widely publicized address continued, "for myself I had rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust, which accepts rumor and gossip in place of undisputed and un intimidated inquiry."

In Judge Hand's opinion, the qualities that clear the path to truth are: skepticism, tolerance, discrimination, urbanity, some—but not too much—reserve toward change, insistence upon proportion and, above all, humility before the vast unknown.

The great judge confessed himself in awe of judicial proceedings and imperfections: "As a litigant I should dread a lawsuit almost anything short of sickness and death."

In one of his last public appearances he cited the chief qualifications of a judge: "Detachment first and then imagination—for after all, the work of a judge, like a poet's or a sculptor's, is an art." He illustrated his faith by quoting a Shakespeare sonnet which is an address to time: "Thou shalt not boast that I do change," and which ends thus:

"This I do vow, and this shall ever be;  
I will be true, despite thy scythe and thee."

—WALTER MONFRIED.

### The Necessity of Farm Subsidies

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the best reasoned statements in justifi-

cation of our farm programs that I have ever seen appeared in the August 27 issue of the Arkansas Gazette. The column by Leland DuVall, in that issue, places our farm programs in perspective and correctly points out that "subsidies are a part of modern economy." It is seldom mentioned in the press that subsidies cover practically every aspect of our economy. Unfortunately, a sizable segment of the public is under the impression that farmers are the only recipients of Government subsidies.

I hope that my colleagues will read this interesting article and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Aug. 27, 1961]  
FARM SUBSIDY PLAN NECESSARY TO KEEP  
ECONOMY VIGOROUS

(By Leland DuVall)

Most nonfarm people—and even many who are connected with agriculture—seem to miss the point entirely when they discuss Government farm programs.

Quite often, it seems, people regard farmers who attempt to defend the principle of Government assistance as pampered pets of the politicians.

The attitude can be explained, in part, by the general lack of understanding of the total farm program. The problem is complicated by the changing conditions in agriculture and by an altered "public image" of the farmer himself.

In the old days, the cartoonist's concept of the farmer—was a rugged individualist with tough corns in his hands, patched overalls and a frayed straw hat. He was satisfied if people stayed out of his affairs and permitted him to battle the weather, diseases in his livestock, insects, tricky markets, and all his other natural enemies. He was a man to be admired, but few people envied him.

This picture was never quite accurate, even when the sparse population made individualists of all Americans. However, the caricature was closer to the truth than the modern image. The more insidious drawings present the farmer as a complaining miser who spends more time standing in line for Government subsidies or counting his money—most of which was derived from Government checks written at the expense of honest taxpayers—than he spends farming the back 40.

Perhaps these cartoons would contain an element of humor if the cruelty could be filtered out. Actually, they are little more than "sick" jokes but the real tragedy is that some people believe they are true.

Admittedly, there are farm subsidies—just as there are subsidies for several other business, labor and professional groups—but the tendency is to exaggerate the amount and ignore the benefits to all the economy that result from keeping agriculture out of bankruptcy.

Subsidies are a part of modern economy, primarily because no one has figured out how to provide equal opportunity—or anything approaching it—by any other method. Agriculture must receive certain benefits because of the long-term practice of having the farmer sell in a buyers market and buy in a sellers market.

E. Hofer & Sons, since 1913 the publisher of Industrial News Review, unexpectedly made out the case for subsidies in its latest issue of the business letter. (Incidentally, the Review is an extremely conservative publication that represents the viewpoint of the far right. Its case for subsidies applied to American steamship lines, not to agricul-

ture. It is flatly against all forms of farm programs.)

"It is the intention of the law that subsidies should do for the American shipping companies what a handicap does for a golfer—put him on equal footing with his competitors," the Review said. "U.S. steamship companies must compete for business with vessels from the rest of the world if they are to keep their ships operating. That is why differential subsidies are, and long have been, an integral part of our merchant marine policy. We must have them if an industry which is essential to our economic well-being and national security is to be kept vigorous."

This is a convincing argument and it applies to agriculture—in spades. The Nation must have an ample supply of farm commodities if the total economy is to remain vigorous. If proof is needed that such a condition would not be possible without some sort of Government assistance it can be found in the preludes to recessions and depressions that periodically swamped the economy in the times before we had a farm program. In each case, agriculture led the way down and it would happen again if Government assistance were withdrawn.

(Here it should be noted that there is a persistent tendency to exaggerate the amount of subsidies farmers receive. Many expenditures that benefit the farmers only indirectly in that they help the total economy are charged off to the Department of Agriculture.)

(The school lunch program is designed primarily for the benefit of urban children—since most of the people live in cities—but its cost is charged against the USDA; meat inspections protect the consumer; many foreign aid donations consist of agricultural commodities and are under the direction of the State Department but the cost often is charged to the Department of Agriculture. All these and many other expenses help swell the budget and create an inflated picture of farm subsidies.)

Perhaps the most damaging error of all to the prestige of the farmer is the common belief that high prices for commodities are responsible for the gradual increase in living expenses. Actually, grocery prices have inched upward for several years while farm markets declined and while the farmer received a progressively smaller share of the consumer dollar. If farm prices had increased at the same rate as other prices, or even held steady, the living costs would have climbed much faster.

W. C. Greenway of Atlanta, program director for the Sears Foundation, discussed the need for improved agricultural public relations last week at a conference of vocational agriculture teachers.

"People today gripe about how little a dollar will buy when compared with 30 years ago, but they are not seeing the whole picture," he said. "The real story is how much an hour of labor today will buy in comparison with the same work unit in the good old days. In 1931 an hour of labor would pay for 1.2 pounds of steak; today it will buy 2.1 pounds. Under the old price relationship, an hour of work would buy 1.3 pounds of bacon; now it will buy 3.3 pounds. The comparison could be extended through the entire grocery list."

This is true as far as it goes but it is not complete. It refers only to the relationship of labor—wages—and agriculture and does not mention the price comparison of farm commodities and industrial or professional income.

An industry that processes farm commodities spends a far smaller percentage of its gross income for raw material than it spent in 1931. Persons engaged in professional or nonmanufacturing enterprises have achieved the same kind of improvement and, in many cases, to a far more favorable degree.



A general understanding of this situation would not solve the farm problem but it would at least remove some of the roadblocks thrown up by well-intentioned people who have not examined all the facts.

### Declaration on Americanism

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ROBERT S. KERR**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Declaration on Americanism, made by the Conference of Grand Masters of Prince Hall Masons of America, in session at Seattle, Wash., on May 13, 1961, representing 39 grand lodges in the United States.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### DECLARATION ON AMERICANISM

To the end that all men might know: The Conference of Grand Masters of Prince Hall Masons of America in session assembled at Seattle, Wash., May 31, 1961, representing 39 grand lodges in the United States, make this pronouncement of its position as to our way of life:

Recognizing that we are in the midst of world upheaval, in an era of unrest and resolution; that in the midst of world crises, there are those who seek to usurp the very foundation of our democratic way of life, and that, in such times of stress and strain and upheaval, our country needs and wants the support of every loyal citizen, Prince Hall Masons everywhere, through the unqualified commitment of the leadership of this conference pledge to support, defend, and protect the American way of life; to uphold the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and to work toward the goal of one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

We further pledge ourselves to make it known throughout the world that as a distinct ethnic group, we are unreservedly opposed to communism—its godless ideology, its subversive activities, its ruthless procedures of violence and deceit and anarchy, and resolved at all hazards to resist in every way, with every possible means and with greatest dispatch, the rising tide of this damning influence. We shall disseminate with all possible zeal, information as to the dangers inherent in this arch foe of Americanism, and constantly warn our people against being deluded by its overtures.

And we further declare that beyond all else, we take the position that our country—America—claims all of us—claims our every passion; her liberties claim our every thought. Our hopes and our labors at all times shall be, in fair weather and in foul, in good times and in bad, that she shall by the blessings of God, become a vast and splendid monument. A monument—not of oppression and of terror—but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberties, and upon which the world may gaze with admiration—forever.

To this we give our heart and hand—God helping us.

Grand masters present: Amos T. Hall, Oklahoma; Richard H. Stitt, New York; Alfred W. McClanahan, Wisconsin; Clark S. Brown, North Carolina; Freddie E. Williams, Oregon; John G. Lewis, Louisiana; William O. Greene, Michigan; Solomon Richardson, Arkansas;

A. William Hill, Jr., Pennsylvania; John L. McHie, Jr., Minnesota; P. G. Porter, Kansas; Samuel T. Daniels, Maryland; Herbert Greenwood, California; J. Blakely, Washington, D.C.; Obed E. Vanderburg, Illinois; Wilbert Kirkpatrick, Missouri; James C. Gilliam, Mississippi; Elijah Johnson, New Mexico; J. T. Maxey, Texas; Johnny Allen, Washington; Carl L. Wilson, Ohio.

### Foreign Assistance Act of 1961

#### SPEECH

OF

**HON. BARRATT O'HARA**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to the great chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has conducted the affairs of his committee in a manner that has won not only the admiration but also in a very real sense the affection of both the Democratic and Republican members of the committee. I join, too, with my colleagues in congratulating Dr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. BURLISON, Mrs. BOLTON, and Dr. JUDG on the tremendous service they have rendered the Congress and the country by returning from the conference with a bill that satisfies the President and that reconciles such differences as there may have been in matters of approach to the objectives of the program.

In voting for the acceptance of the conferees' report, however, I shall have a sense of deep regret that the language of the House bill on the matter of international waterways and discrimination has been watered down. Very much of what I feel was expressed in the remarks of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN].

It had been my privilege and pleasure to work with Mr. FARBERSTEIN and Mr. HAYS in the framing of the statement of policy as regards international waterways that was contained in the Mutual Security Act of 1960. It will be recalled that this statement of policy as regards international waterways that originated in the House was objected to in the other body, that there was a long debate on the floor of the other body, and that after the debate there was a vote, and the other body by a substantial majority elected to stand with the House and the language remained in the bill.

This to me was proof positive that the statement of policy as regards international waterways in the Mutual Security Act of 1960 was in conformance with the thinking of a vast majority of the Members of both bodies of the Congress.

This year the Committee on Foreign Affairs by a unanimous vote reinserted the language in the Mutual Security bill of this year, and added thereto other strong language firmly stating the position of the United States of America on the matter of discrimination against any Americans in whatever land stationed on the lines of religion. The vote in our

committee on this reaffirmation of the moral law was unanimous. There was not a voice raised against it on the floor of the House, and from this I can conclude that the statement in the House bill as regards international waterways and religious discrimination expressed the thinking of every Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we win strong and enduring friendships when we seek temporary favors by the barter of our self respect. As an American I wish no more nor no less than that which is accorded all other Americans. Members of this body have been denied access to other countries because their approach to the understanding of their relationship with the infinite was through a religious faith not in favor in those lands. Frankly, I do not see how we can hold up our heads with self-respect if we permit any country to discriminate against Americans on any other grounds than those of character.

I am happy and I am proud that the body of which I am a Member has asserted its position, without one dissenting vote, on this fundamental issue of the moral law as applied to foreign policy.

I am confident that had the membership of the other body been given the opportunity of expressing itself directly on this issue, its decision would have been exactly the same as that expressed in the House.

### On Acceptance of Conference Report of Foreign Aid Bill

#### SPEECH

OF

**HON. ALPHONZO E. BELL, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I am against passage of the conference version of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. My opposition is not because I am opposed to foreign aid in principle, but because I feel that the conference version failed to actually and completely eliminate the so-called back-door spending feature of the program. Contract authority, along with the public debt transaction, note cancellation and revolving funds, comprise the four types of back-door devices which abrogate congressional control of the purse strings.

It is my conclusion, after careful consideration and after listening to the debate on the floor that once the executive branch of our Government commits to another nation for assistance, that the House of Representatives and the Senate are morally obligated to fulfill the commitment. I object to the House of Representatives abrogating any of its exclusive prerogative to originate and pass upon bills permitting withdrawal of money from the Treasury. The U.S. Constitution specifically sets out this responsibility as an exclusive duty of this legislative body.

Further, there was some indication on the floor that perhaps the legislative



branch of our Government would not be able to obtain all of the facts in detail pertaining to these loans and grants once committed. In other words, under the cloak of executive privilege, documents and evidence essential to congressional scrutiny of foreign aid programs may be denied.

In conclusion, let me point out that perhaps our most successful foreign aid program was the Marshall plan which was fundamentally based on annual appropriations by the legislative branch of our Government. This is a shining example of a program succeeding without rigid long-term commitments.

### Khrushchev Declares for "International Anarchy" if Not Given His Way

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER**  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent declaration by Mr. Khrushchev that Russia will renew atomic testing, I am glad to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of a talk by Mr. Stuart L. Hannon of the Free Europe Committee, Inc., which was delivered before the Commonwealth Club of California on August 18:

(By Stuart L. Hannon)

"Sir Henry Layard, a British Ambassador of the last century, who probably knew the Russians as well as anyone today, once observed: 'My experience of Russian diplomats has led me to believe that they are so trained to habits of deception and dissimulation that their word can be rarely if ever depended upon.'"

The influence of fuzzy thinking, the homilies of chronic penitents and apostolic moralists, tend to lose their cloudy persuasion, as the Soviet Communist forces bear down on freedom with increasing ruthlessness.

For example we have finally dropped the absurd plan to recognize Outer Mongolia, and presumably we will come to our complete senses about Red China.

Our policy planning is now beginning, at last, to recognize the role of trade as a weapon, wielded so far only by the enemy, and we may well consider embargoes, boycotts, perhaps even sanctions.

Probably the greatest positive achievement for the Western World in our century took place early this month. I refer to the British decision to join the European Economic Community, to cross that channel which has been an almost incalculable barrier to European security and understanding. This tremendous advance, together with the remarkable Franco-German rapprochement, bridges an outdated and often tragic system for which both England and the Continent have paid dearly.

Today, as in 1939, international law is confronted by unparalleled international anarchy, spearheaded and manipulated by the Soviet Union. Only last month Khrushchev threatened to oppose the entire United Nations, even if they agreed as one against Soviet policy.

His words: "Even if all countries of the world adopted a decision which did not ac-

cord with the interests of the Soviet Union and threatened its security, the Soviet Union would not recognize such a decision but would uphold its rights, relying on force."

#### ANY POINT IN KEEPING RELATIONS WITH SOVIET?

Earlier he had stated, "Even if 99 percent of the General Assembly voted in favor of Dag Hammarskjöld, the Soviet Union would still oppose him." This is the kind of chaos, of course, which leaves open to serious question the purpose of having any relations with the Soviet Union.

Power is more monstrous today because of the existence of a predatory leviathan state which has employed, and threatens to employ, all of its national force and its international conspiracy, in defiance of international law, to destroy all who reject its dominion, large nations as well as small, committed as well as neutral. Even Communist states which prefer a neutral role, completely independent from the Soviet Union, are in danger.

Its aim is still a world Communist confederation commanded by the U.S.S.R.; its method international civil war.

We have been losing the cold war for some time and the immediate future indicates no change. The stock reasons given for our predicament are complacency, arrogant confidence, preoccupation with materialistic pursuits.

#### U.S. PROBLEM IS IGNORANCE OF ADVERSARY

Such a diagnosis simply doesn't hold up. Our problem is not complacency but ignorance of the adversary to our system, and of the national psychology we need to win.

The clue to everything is whether we want to win the cold war; whether we want to survive. If we cannot win the cold war, if we cannot understand the need to defeat decisively the Soviet resolve to put us out of business, our defeat will result.

We must with discipline, innovation, courage and even ruthlessness, set about to undermine the Soviet and Communist conspiracy by every means at our disposal.

#### NEGOTIATION COULD WEAKEN U.S. POWER, PRESTIGE

We cannot accomplish this and at the same time negotiate, arbitrate, or associate with the dedicated and implacable forces of communism in any way which will weaken our power or prestige, above all in the eyes of those whose respect, and possibly allegiance, we are trying to influence.

#### FIVE GREAT STRENGTHS OF WEST

This is a fact of power and propaganda which we have not understood and still do not understand.

#### Let us assess Western power:

First of all, the people of the United States and Western Europe (530 millions) vastly outnumber the population of the entire Soviet bloc.

Second, West European and American industry in terms of steel, 61 percent of world output, hydroelectric power, coal, etc., not to mention purchasing power, can run circles around the Soviet Union.

Third, a good 75 million people of the Soviet bloc, in case of a showdown, are quite unlikely to remain chattels and serfs of Russia if they see a clearly demonstrated effort in behalf of their freedom by the West, to which civilization they preferably belong.

Fourth, there is NATO, strengthened and united as a result of the Oslo Conference, renewed U.S. commitments, and Soviet behavior of recent weeks.

#### UNITED STATES HAS 1,700 STRATEGIC BOMBERS—RUSSIA 150

Fifth, we have approximately 1,700 strategic bombers as compared with 150 for the Soviet Union. On the seas, the Russians have nothing remotely comparable to our Polaris submarines, not to mention our car-

rier and supporting fleet units. When it comes to ICBM's, we seem to be about equal. Even assuming that Russia may have substantially more, Khrushchev, Malinovsky, and all the rest of the pack know as well as anyone who can count, that they couldn't begin to cover all of our ICBM bases, SAC bases, and heavy naval units. And in addition to our heavy, long-range equipment, there are, as we know, large stores of medium-range missiles and medium bombers based close enough to Russia to pay personal visits.

#### MR. K. HAS HEADACHES

Then, Khrushchev has such imponderables as agricultural problems, the Moslem and other minorities in the Soviet Union, stoppage of much needed trade with the outside world, possible involvement of Japan and the Nationalist Chinese armies, and even the Red Chinese, who might enjoy overrunning new positions around the U.S.S.R. Even in the name of Leninism, this would not please the Kremlin.

I mention these facts only to emphasize the fact that we of the West are far from helpless. In fact, it is our refusal to wither away that so irks the Soviet Union.

We still possess enormous power, enough I firmly believe to bury the Soviet system several times over.

To me this means we should employ this power to the hilt—politically, economically, socially, propagandistically. In dealing with an aggressor who has dealt only with power, we should certainly never apologize for our power.

#### WE MUSTN'T BARGAIN WITH COMMUNIST DRIVE

(It might be good if even the press would cut down on the psychological advantages that they hand Russia free of charge. In fact, communism should be asked to pay for publicity space like any other patent medicine.)

Fortunately, Soviet and Communist provocations are bringing us around to a position of rising up from the reclining and squirming positions we have occupied for so long.

Soviet charges of American militarism and sanctimonious walling about colonialism can be handled by counterpropaganda; our policymakers, the military and least of all the President, should not preoccupy themselves with such drivel, bicker or bargain with it.

A most competent social scientist says "we lack a philosophy of the place of power in modern institutional life."

Our intellectuals are fond of quoting "power corrupts." "Weakness invites" is more appropriate for our time.

#### MUST PROVE SUPPORT OF HUMANITY BY ACTIONS

Those who find promising the atmosphere of perpetual debate must remember that behind all the language of negotiation and intent lies force, naked power. This reality must be faced, contained and in one way or another reduced to civilized restraints if democracy is ever to triumph over totalitarianism.

There should be from any point of view a shift of emphasis which correlates the central theme of foreign policy, not to an attack of war but rather to the support of freedom for all humanity, a firm commitment of policy to all efforts which prove by words and actions our support of common humanity. Thomas Mann said, "What is needed is a militant humanism."

A most remarkable fusing of power and propaganda is Soviet manipulation of the word-concept, "peace," as an instrument of force, tension, and blackmail, the propaganda of peace as a master key to unlock the minds and defenses of the West or of parliamentary systems which block Soviet power.

Our ability to cope with ruthless adversaries is impaired by a national psychology



which considers power as evil and propaganda as something insidious or untrue.

Propaganda itself can be an instrument of power when it becomes a substitute for the latter because of the skill of one nation in applying both elements and the inability of another nation to understand either. It is regrettable that a substantial segment of American public opinion reflexes are still subject to facile manipulation.

#### RED PROPAGANDA MAKES NAZIS LOOK MODEST

We are combatting a world power and propaganda skill which makes the limited Nazi effort look comparatively modest.

There is considerable difference between admitting heavy losses in the field or on the home front, in time of war, and giving generous coverage to political, economic or social failures of a system which its dedicated enemy for 40 years has already seriously undermined, both in its influence and security, by doing the same thing.

It is both fallacious and foolish to present this unbalanced world (more than half of which is hardly capable of calm reason and political wisdom with a so-called objective balance of good and bad), commendatory and derogatory, in our overseas broadcasts.

#### WHY ADVERTISE OUR SHORTCOMINGS TO WORLD?

There are many U.S. proponents of self-flagellation and intellectual masochism as a stunning method of winning friends and influencing people. There has been much of this, I regret to say, in many American broadcasts, not to mention American newspapers, minimizing our successes, giving more coverage to Soviet or Communist "persuasion" than to our own on vital international issues, proving how impartial we are by playing up our failures, even when no comment is needed. The practice of Radio Free Europe, for example, is to do all possible to win the cause as one wins a good case, by dramatizing its merits—not explaining them in terms of enemy obloquy—by outlining its strength and not its weakness, by emphasizing majority observance rather than minority abuse, by letting the whole society speak for itself, historically as well as currently, and not by misrepresented or distorted by fractional or dissected elements thereof, in the puerile assumption that such an image, i.e., any image out of context, is an objective image or necessary to the effort.

There is a historic truth about this Nation and everything for which it stands, which can be slowly undermined by a puritanic code of publicizing every unpleasant fact that mars a good society.

#### WE WOULD WIN BY STRESSING OUR MERITS

An example of racist brutality in Alabama does not represent the truth of race relations on that day in the other 49 States. This is one area of distortion in which Communist and Soviet propaganda does not need our assistance. The American case will be won on the central truth of its overall merit, not by a parade of its defects. Our own propaganda is not only ineffective, but destructive, when it attempts to compete in this schizophrenic state, trying on the one hand to counter communism and on the other, so understating or overstating our own case that it becomes false.

Victories will not be won by patterns of retreat or compromise, above all when such patterns are unilateral or suggest in any way the negotiation of issues out of fear or weakness.

#### COMMUNISTS USE BRUTE FORCE AND BRUTE INTELLECT

The Soviet Communists are not just brute force, they are brute intellect; they represent not only physical power but dialectical brilliance, and there are whole mobs of Western publicists trying to oppose them without knowing the maze of transubstan-

tiation through which they work, and possibly without ever having read anything of Hegel, Marx, Engels, Lenin.

We must have "a crash program for peace"; we are now near the moment of truth when we require immediate investment, with all the brains and money available, in a dynamic crusade for the security of American free enterprise. Government has done about all it can, whether well or badly is now immaterial, and every Government initiative now is dangerous initiative. The leviathan states of the nuclear era are virtually stalemated so far as the uses of physical power are concerned. The tocsin has sounded for total utilization of the immense resources and genius of the Nation's industry.

#### U.S. FREE ENTERPRISE CAN DO WHAT GOVERNMENT CAN'T

President Kennedy himself last February, before the National Industrial Conference Board, as much as said: "Help me." "We know," he said, "that your success and ours are intertwined, that you have facts and know-how we need. We seek the spirit of a full-fledged alliance." This leaves the methodology up to free enterprise.

American private enterprise must enlist the people of the world by helping them to acquire proprietary interests, allowing them practice as well as promise, reaching them directly and not remotely through incumbent governments, which may fall tomorrow.

#### COMMUNISTS WORK FROM BOTTOM

One reason why Communists have been successful in the economic-political complex of emerging nations is because they have worked from the bottom, and by the time we have begun to pour in from the top, there is a considerable base of opposition to capitalist plots, intervention, and the like.

With practical emphasis on freedom in free enterprise, with tangible evidence of enterprise as a creative value for little men, with demonstrable proof that free enterprise demands peace for progress and therefore cannot possibly espouse war, by such statesmanship the American businessman can give himself, his government and the underdeveloped nations greater benefits than all three have ever known before.

#### HANNON ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. (Hilary H. Crawford, Sr.): What can we do to improve our propaganda?

Answer. Government and business together should mobilize far more than in the past. The Soviet attack has from the beginning concentrated on religion and on free enterprise. There should be a very close partnership between the Government and free enterprise in fighting the cold war.

Question. Radio Free Europe propaganda effective?

Answer. Propaganda can only be effective as to foreign policy. We cannot create the illusion of success when success is nonexistent.

Question. (Edgar M. Kahn): Should press-radio freedom in reporting news be curbed in a democracy during peacetime or in a cold war?

Answer. A loaded question. Answer is "Yes" and "No." Recalls President Kennedy's recent efforts to secure cooperation from publishers. Is a matter of judgment. Free press depends on a free nation—so there is mutual responsibility. And this is not peacetime—this is a cold war.

Question. (Robert Konter): Is Russian fear campaign causing timidity in our foreign policy?

Answer. No—not now. We have reached turning point. Reverse is now going into effect. State Department Secretary Dean Rusk's speeches now are contradicting some of his earlier expressed views.

Question. (Gen. B. G. Cheynoweth): Lenin emphasized action is true foundation

of good propaganda; do we not attribute too much importance to words unrelated to action?

Answer. Yes—attribute far too much to words unrelated to action. We should insist upon academic courses in our university that teach the Communist dialectic and how to combat it.

## Combating Communism Effectively

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Lutheran Witness recently published the second in a series of articles by the Reverend Lambert Brose. In this article, he asks, "Why Does Communism Appeal?"

Because his answer is extremely interesting and informative, I ask unanimous consent to have this article reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMBATING COMMUNISM EFFECTIVELY, II—WHY COMMUNISM APPEALS—WHAT DOES A COMMUNIST LOOK LIKE?—THE 1961 VERSION, I MEAN—LIKE SOME DIRTY, UNSHAVEN BUM?—A SKID-ROW TYPE DERELICT?

(By Lambert Brose)

That's the mental image I've had of a Communist all my life—the Bolshevik in the newspaper cartoon. But chances are I couldn't be more wrong. The typical Communist Party member, 1961 style, is not "ugly" at all. In fact, to millions of people in certain parts of the world he's "beautiful."

#### COMMUNISM IS "BEAUTIFUL"

And communism itself, the 1961 version, is not repulsive. Communism is very attractive—to the natural instincts and desires of man.

You'd think this would be perfectly clear to those who really want to fight this godless ideology. But it isn't. I sincerely believe that most Americans—and most American Christians—fail to see how beautiful communism is to multitudes, especially in the underdeveloped nations of the world.

And this, it seems to me, is one of the main reasons why we've been taking a sensational licking from the Marxists—in parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Until we understand the tremendous appeal communism has for many people, we won't fight it very effectively.

#### MANY FACES

It should be understood that statements in this article about communism's "beauty" refer only to certain aspects of Communist activity. Not, obviously, to the tactics of ruthless force used in taking over Eastern Europe and mainland China and other parts of the world, when millions of people lost their homes, when their friends and relatives were murdered. These victims will always recognize communism for what it really is—ugliness at its worst.

Moreover, communism itself has not changed. It will, whenever and wherever it can, "liquidate" those who are hopelessly indoctrinated with capitalistic ideas, those who cannot be "educated" to the "beauty" of the "Communist state."

But communism, 1961 style, has many faces. Confronted with a nuclear stalemate,



Communists are fighting world war III in some parts of the world with medicine, machinery, literature, and culture.

For millions—especially in the "have not" nations—this fair face of communism has great appeal.

#### "CREAM OF THE CROP"

"Communist Party members are beautiful." Let's study this statement a little further. It helps explain why communism has made such strides.

There are some 200 million people in Russia. Only about 1 of every 40 is a member of the Communist Party.

Red China now has a population of roughly 700 million. Only about 1 of every 100,000 is a member of the party.

Why? Because the party wants nothing but the best. The cream of the crop. The "upper class"—ironical as it sounds in the framework of Marxist thinking.

Communist Party members in Russia for example, are absolutely among the best educated, brilliant, dedicated people in the Soviet Union. If they weren't, if they didn't have some outstanding ability, the party would never accept them as members.

Lenin once said: "It would be a mistake to imagine that it is enough to adopt the Communist formulas and conclusions of Communist science without mastering the sum total of different branches of knowledge. Communism becomes an empty phrase, a mere facade, and the Communist a mere bluffer if he has not worked over in his consciousness the whole inheritance of human knowledge."

#### COMMUNISTS ARE SMART OPERATORS

In reality, of course, Communists are not well educated or brilliant at all. They're the greatest of fools. "The fool hath said in his heart, 'there is no God,'" the Bible tells us.

But in the earthly, worldly sense they're "among the top 5 percent of their class."

If we are to combat communism effectively, let's get one thing straight: We're up against some of the smartest operators on this planet.

#### BREAD

Of greater importance is the fact that communism itself is most appealing to millions.

There are two reasons for this. First: Three-fifths of the people on earth today, we are often told, go to bed hungry almost every night of their lives. Groaning under the glut of farm surpluses, Americans find it hard to picture this. But millions upon millions of our fellow human beings rarely know what it means to be without the gnawing pain of hunger.

To these people the Communist offer—bread.

As a rule, hungry people do not ask where the bread is coming from. All they want is to ease those awful pangs of hunger.

We're talking about bread in the wider sense, of course. Bread. Rice. Milk. Clothing. Shoes. A roof overhead. A plot of ground.

To be sure, the Western World, especially its Christians, also give bread to the hungry. Lutheran World Relief and other church and private agencies are doing an outstanding job.

#### THOSE GREAT HUMANITARIANS

But the Communists offer bread in a still wider sense.

In most of the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America there are only two classes of people: the extremely rich and the extremely poor. There are no middle classes.

The Communists—those great "humanitarians"—come into a country and say, "It isn't right that a few people in your land should have millions and millions of dollars, while the rest of you go hungry most of the time. Stand up and throw off the

chains. We'll help you. We'll give you guns and planes to revolt against the rich. We'll redistribute this wealth. We'll give you a plot of ground for your very own."

To the poor, starving wretches of the world, such a generous offer looks simply beautiful.

Only later on do most of them find out they've been duped, that they themselves have not become owners of the land, that the Communist state has taken over, that they are merely slaves.

Then, of course, Communists and communism become repulsive. Then communism shows up for what it really is—a bestial teaching of the devil, leading people into slavery and hell. But by then it's usually too late.

#### HAVEN'T READ ABOUT STALIN

You see, most of these unfortunate people haven't read how Stalin laid the foundations of Russia's booming industry by exploiting the peasants of the U.S.S.R.—killing millions of them in the process via the starvation route.

They haven't read how Mao is doing the same thing in Red China today. On a much larger scale.

They haven't read or heard much about these things. Because in these faraway places Communist propaganda is outgunning the West decisively.

#### NOT PREPARED FOR INDEPENDENCE

To people whose stomachs cry out so loud they can't hear anything else the Communist promise of bread is beautiful indeed.

Add to that these facts: The people of the newly emerging nations are intensely nationalistic. The Communists capitalize on this drive.

Some colonial powers have not prepared their former territories for self-government or for economic independence. The Communists quickly fill the vacuum, pouring in political advisers, technicians, teachers. They ship in goods produced cheaply under dictator methods for political purposes.

It isn't hard to see why communism has such great appeal to newly emerging governments and their peoples.

#### WHAT COMMUNISM TEACHES

Second: The theory of communism appeals strongly to the natural mind of man.

This is what communism teaches:

As it is in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, so all human society is composed, to a greater or lesser degree, of two classes of people: those who own the means of production, possessing great wealth; and those who do the monotonous, hard, physical labor involved in production—but do not receive much of the fruits of their labor.

In many parts of the world this distinction holds true to a greater degree. In North America, Europe, Australia, and several other areas, however, it's true to a far lesser degree. (To observers who note how millions of people—even a few in the lower income brackets—own stocks in the United States, this "two classes" theory doesn't hold much water at all. But in about two-thirds of the world it does.)

#### "CAPITALISM WILL FALL"

Now, say the Communists, we shall work for the day when there will no longer be the owners who possess—and the laborers who do not possess. We shall work for the day when all of us will share the world's goods—more or less equally. "To each according to his needs, and from each according to his ability."

The history of mankind, say the Communists, is a record of constant conflict. Out of this struggle—by means of revolution—new forms of society continually develop. Capitalism and communism will fight it out until some day capitalism will be defeated. Just as feudalism gave way to capitalism,

capitalism ultimately, through a series of gradations, will give way to communism. It's absolutely inevitable, they say. It can't miss.

The Communist Manifesto does not argue, for example, that these changes ought to occur. Marx continually stresses the fact that they will occur. Communism teaches that its eventual triumph is as certain as death and taxes.

#### BLUEPRINT FOR UTOPIA

And communism has very specific information and blueprints for man to use in achieving this utopia.

A Communist is taught, for example, that utopia will be won through the use of many methods: war, peace, economic penetration, subversion, occasional collaboration with the enemy, murder, foreign aid, propaganda, psychology—even a posed, temporary tolerance of religion, where this may be helpful to the cause.

And the party member receives rigorous training in how to utilize this great variety of weapons.

Communism's blueprints are wrong, of course, but they sound plausible. And so often the natural mind of man is impressed by a logical presentation, by the outward form of something rather than by its contents. He likes everything neatly laid out for him. He doesn't like to think too much. Communism does his thinking for him. Communism explains everything.

Do you begin to see something of the great appeal of communism?

I myself—a man—a woman—together with other men and women can achieve this paradise. I can do something worthwhile in this humdrum life. I'm working for a tremendous goal. Not for pie in the sky, as Communists like to call it sarcastically. But for a world in which every person will have enough of this world's goods to live comfortably—or at least not starve.

#### ULTIMATE IN WORK RIGHTEOUSNESS

This is the ultimate in salvation by works. This is what natural man wants.

After all, the Christian doctrine does not appeal to natural man, man as he is before the Holy Spirit regenerates him. Salvation by grace alone, by the cross of Christ, is foolishness, says the Bible—to those who are not Christians.

Man as he is by birth, man in his sinful state, wants to be self-made in every way, also spiritually. He wants to be known as a man who pays his own way.

#### APPEALS TO MAN'S IDEALISM

Christianity is beautiful to man only when the Holy Spirit, working through the Word, has changed his natural heart and has made the love of Christ appealing to him. Then it is the most beautiful of all doctrines.

But to unregenerate man a salvation given full and free as an act of divine grace alone is abhorrent and ridiculous.

Communism, however, is something else again—an ideology whereby man through his own efforts can change the world. That's beautiful. That appeals to his idealism. That challenges him.

#### THERE IS NO GOD

Above all, how beautiful to natural man is this basic teaching of communism: There is no God. Along with political independence communism offers independence from God.

Communism teaches that everything is material. There is nothing spiritual. No soul. No life after death. Nothing at all supernatural.

Under communism man is not accountable for his sins. And, of course, there is no morality—not in the sense that we speak of morality. If lying will help bring about this perfect world of the classless society, lying becomes good. If robbery and murder



and subversion will help—even these become moral.

#### OPIATE OF THE MASSES

A supernatural God? Not for a Communist. Religion is the opiate of the people, the gin fizz of the masses. He—man—is god. At least so he tells himself.

And because the church teaches there is a God, the church must be "purged."

#### CHURCH SERVICES IN RUSSIA?

Let us not be taken in by what we hear about the existence of Christian churches behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. For propaganda purposes, Communists sometimes allow some churches to function—after a fashion. A case in point is the much-publicized Baptist church in Moscow. This number of congregations allowed to conduct services varies in different countries according to the expediency of the moment. Whenever it suits their purposes, Communists will pose as being tolerant of religion.

#### J. EDGAR HOOVER'S WARNING

Calling attention to this tactic, J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, quotes a Communist writer as stating: "The people's state holds that the question of religious belief is a private matter; belief or nonbelief in religion relates to the personal freedom of an individual."

But, as Mr. Hoover warns, let's not be fooled. The campaign against the Christian religion is unrelenting. The pressures—subtle or not so subtle—on people who try to live their religion are tremendous.

"Question 7," the Lutheran Film Associates, Inc., production, a documented motion picture describing how difficult it is to be a practicing Christian in East Germany, bears eloquent testimony to these pressures.

The Christian church—as an effective influence in men's lives—must eventually be destroyed. "We shall remain the atheists that we have always been," said Khrushchev.

#### "NOT THROUGH EVERY MUDHOLE"

It isn't necessary for a Christian to have an extensive and profound knowledge of the teachings of Communist theorists—Marx, Lenin, Engels, and others—to combat their atheistic ideas effectively.

As it is with all other sin, so it is with communism. One of our seminary professors used to say in regard to sin, "You don't have to wade through every mud hole in the neighborhood to know that it's dirty."

However, a Christian certainly ought to make the effort to know as much as he can about this "disease" so that his opposition will not merely consist in spouting ineffective anti-Communist slogans. A Christian must be able to do something that really counts in the fight against this terrible menace to mankind.

#### BEWARE OF THE MAILS

In connection with the final article in this series we shall publish a bibliography. Meanwhile, a word of caution: Beware of the literature on communism that comes to you through the mail. Beware of it as you would of taking all the medicines advertised through the mail, without consulting your doctor. Some of those medicines could kill you.

Just because a pamphlet or book is anti-Communist doesn't mean that it's good. Hitler, too, was anti-Communist—most of the time.

Arbitrarily being against everything the Communists stand for can do great harm, because Christians—and believers in republicanism and democracy and capitalism—also stand for some of the same things the Communists stand for.

For example, as we have tried to show in this and the preceding article, Christians, capitalists, and Communists sometimes use seemingly identical methods in trying to build their totally different worlds: feeding

the hungry, educating the illiterate, and healing the sick.

Blind anticommunism often only causes division and weakens the forces opposing this evil ideology, so menacing to us all. Thus it only furthers the Communist cause.

### International Relations Between United States and Canada

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we realize that our Nation has been the envy of the world and that envy in international feelings often results in intemperate opinions and actions on the part of nations which should exercise better judgment.

The slow but steady deterioration in United States-Canadian relations has been almost entirely the responsibility of misguided activities by Canadian officials and deliberate acts of distortion in presenting to their public the relationship of the United States to their domestic economy and their international trade problems. Much too rarely has the contribution of American capital and American enterprises and individuals to the steady growth of the Canadian economy been emphasized and appreciated by the leaders north of the border.

Mr. Speaker, a most timely comment on the latest Canadian activities appeared in the August 26 edition of Chicago's American in the column by George Sokolsky. In view of the penetrating nature of this article, I wish to insert it into the RECORD at this point:

CANADA WOOS CUBA, SPITES US

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The Canadian airlift to Cuba makes no sense. The business is not large enough to justify the inevitable loss of American friendship. To most Americans, it looks like spite. The Cubans are taking every advantage of the Canadians because they assume the Canadians are greedy and willing to make any sacrifice to get business. The best example is the use of Cuban-hired Canadian planes rather than shipping on Canadian freight planes.

I quote an instance from the Financial Post of Toronto:

"One airline—World-Wide Airways of Montreal—holds an air transport board license to airlift freight from Canada to Cuba.

"Company complains it's not getting any business, and a DC-4 sits idle at Montreal Airport.

"Another airline—International Airfreighters of Edmonton—bought a North Star plane from Trans-Canada Airlines in May, assembled Canadian airmen, and 'dry leased' the plane and crew to Cubana (the Cuban airline).

"This company has been moving practically all of the Canadian air cargo to and from Cuba, and the owners say they are making money."

#### BASIC COMMUNIST ASSUMPTION

What the Canadian expected of the Cubans is hard to say. Cuba is a Communist state and, like all Communists, assumes that cap-

italists will do anything to get income; that capitalists have no honor or patriotism; that all that is necessary is to hold a carrot in front of a capitalist and he rushes forward even into a cesspool.

The Air Industries and Transport Association of Canada has urged the Canadian Government to "act immediately to withdraw permission for further Cuban flights until such time as the Cuban Government agrees to live up to a firm understanding."

The Canadians thought they had a 50-50 deal with the Cubans but now discover they have been done in. There are always selfish businessmen who adopt the attitude that a sale is a sale—no matter to whom or what for. They are like some American companies who situate branches in European countries so that they can sell to Russia, in absolute betrayal of their own country. Last Sunday, 1,500 American boys risked their lives by riding into West Berlin along a 110 mile lane of peril; they might have been shot down by steel manufactured by American-owned plants situated in European countries.

#### GOOD RULE, UNLESS IT KILLS YOU

The Cubans, being Marxists, count on this attitude on the part of Canadian sellers: Sell anything to any buyer. It is a good rule unless the buyer turns around to kill the seller.

No American can develop much sympathy for any Canadian who loses by his trading with Cuba. The Canadians went into the Cuban market with the intention of capturing a new market even if to do so meant to hurt the United States, its close and longtime friend. Suffering from false pride and petty nationalism, there are those in Canada who believe that it does not matter that they damage United States-Canada relations; that the United States will take anything that comes along.

The truth is that the American people are weary of being abused by countries which depend upon American capital for their development and the American market for their trade.

Mr. Sokolsky, writing in the August 28 issue of Chicago's American, discusses another subject of immediate importance to us; namely, the policymaking operations within our administration, and more specifically, the State Department. I wish to insert the article into the RECORD at this point:

#### REMOVE POLICY BLUNDERERS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Politicians play little games that often involve costly irretrievable errors. Some are not understandable, such as the establishment of the American Zone of West Berlin inside East Germany—110 miles inside without a corridor. If there was to be a divided Berlin, each sector should have had a corridor. By agreement, Berlin was divided into American, British, French, and Russian sectors. The Western countries united and the people of West Berlin elected a government of their own, headed by Mayor Willy Brandt.

Russia declined to join in this renationalization of Berlin, and established East Germany as a separate area, controlled by the Soviet Union. This was a violation of all agreements, but Russia has maintained there are two Germanys, that there will remain two, and that Berlin actually is within the Soviet Zone, in East Germany. Therefore the Western Powers, who may be there legally, are there irrationally.

#### KENNEDY CHALLENGED RUSS VIEW

Khrushchev makes this point now. He holds that after 16 years, a settlement must be reached that makes sense from the Russian standpoint. President Kennedy has challenged the Russian point of view in the most practical manner possible, by sending



troops into Berlin and by sending Vice President JOHNSON there.

The initial error undoubtedly was made by President Truman, Prime Ministers Churchill and Attlee, and the American and British chiefs of staff who accepted the Russian formula. It was unsound when adopted and is unsound now.

This kind of historical error not only was made as regards Berlin but also as regards China. I have been reading Robert Morris' remarkable book, "No Wonder We Are Losing," in which he gives the details of his services as a counsel for congressional committees.

#### TELLS RED AGENTS' ACTIVITIES

He establishes beyond question the activities of Russian agents and spies within the State Department and White House. He describes carefully what we now call, to avoid libel, "Russian-oriented" persons who played an enormous role in the development of American policy toward Red China.

A final example of error and carelessness is to be found in the entire Cuban mess, including the amateurish and abortive invasion.

This country will have to take a sterner attitude toward experts who make mistakes.

### A Kind Word for a Much Maligned Species

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, kicking Congressmen around has been a favorite American sport since colonial days. However, once in a great while one of the Nation's leaders will say a few kind words about us Members and the work we do. The September 1, 1961, issue of *Forbes* magazine carries one of the most perceptive pieces that I have ever read in our defense.

It is written by the magazine's publisher and editor in chief, Malcolm S. Forbes, himself a man of great experience and solid accomplishment in the field of government. Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

#### A KIND WORD FOR A MUCH MALIGNED SPECIES (By Malcolm S. Forbes)

Along with mothers-in-law, Congressmen are America's favorite whipping boys. As the current session pushes toward adjournment, the usual chorus of gripes against Congressmen rises from a thousand typewriters and a thousand rostrums.

Take this matter of winding up the current session. There are those who have demanded that Congress stay in session until certain pet legislation has been passed. Others insist that it would be sheer folly for Congress to adjourn during the Berlin crisis. Yet some of the most vocal of these "stay-in-Washington" groups are the very ones who gripe when their Congressman is unavailable for local ribbon-cuttings and complain that "the only time we ever see you around is at election time." So it goes. On the matter of adjournment, as in most other matters, the Congressman is likely to be damned if he does and damned if he doesn't.

At the risk of being shot at as un-American during this open season on our lawmakers, I'd like to defend the much-maligned Congressmen. Yes, all of them. Even that handful who are so benighted and willful as to fail to see things my way.

I'll defend, for example, the mail-watchers. This group, much scorned by high-minded do-gooders, actually performs a rather useful function in our society. The mail-watchers, those sensitive souls, have but one conviction: The importance of their own reelection. About burning issues, expect no firm expressions of opinions from them. To do may be to die if they decide to reason why on a legislative hot potato. They weigh, not the issue, but the mail.

Perhaps this type of Congressman is not actually a social scientist's idea of what the Founding Fathers had in mind for Congress. But the stubborn fact is that they perform a valuable function all the same. No scientist has yet devised a seismograph more sensitive than a Congressman holding up a wet finger into the political winds. No rhapsodic rhetoric about ideals or visions of sugar plums will garner their vote—unless it looks like most of the "folks back home" have been moved too—and first. In short, the mail-watcher, however timid his character, plays a rather important part in making representative government really representative.

In further defense of our legislative branch, I'd like to mention an even larger group. This sizable majority of representatives spends month after month trying to figure out what they think may be best for the country by the way of a new law or no new law. These misguided fellows aren't obliging to accept my opinion—sometimes not even yours. They've even indicated our personnel opinion may be selfishly motivated, that there may be two sides to the issue. There fellows may even listen to those who disagree with us.

So they go on and do all sorts of foolish things for a good many hours after any sensible man has gone home from work. They hold committee hearings, public, and private. They pass hours listening to visiting constituents. They even seem to spend a lot of time answering their mail and looking into, first hand, some of the operations of Government for which the committees they belong to are responsible.

Taking into account all three categories of Congressmen—the stubborn, the seismographers, and the bunch we were just talking about—it is sort of a wonder anything good gets done by them. Yet it does. That's why I wanted to take time out from the good old American sport of Congressmen-sniping to say a word on behalf of our lawmakers.

### Pay Increases for Postal Workers

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which will amend the law relating to longevity step increases for postal workers. This bill is a companion measure to legislation previously introduced by other Members of Congress in the House and the Senate.

Over the years it has been the intent of the Congress to eliminate some of the discrimination against postal employees,

and this bill will give them benefits comparable to those now enjoyed under the Classification Act by other Federal employees.

Under the law now in effect regular civil service employees receive longevity increases after 10, 13, and 16 years' service in the same grade. However, as a result of the antiquated law affecting postal employees they receive such increases only after 13, 18, and 25 years' service in grade.

The approval of this legislation will bring the benefits of postal employees more in line with those accorded other employees of the Federal Government, and will correct an inequity which has been in existence far too long.

The Senate has already acted on similar legislation, having passed S. 1459 on July 17; and I am very pleased to see that our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service had referred the legislation to the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, which held hearings on the same yesterday. I am hopeful that prompt and favorable consideration of the bill can be completed in the near future.

### Needed: A Broader Agricultural Education

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART**

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, in these days when the competition to enter college is so keen, it is remarkable to learn that enrollment in one vital sector of education is falling off. Only about half as many agricultural degrees were granted in 1958 as in 1950, and the trend apparently is continuing. At the same time, agriculture and businesses directly related to agriculture offer 15,000 new jobs per year.

The summer issue of *Corn*, a quarterly published by Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., succinctly reviews this problem. The article deals with the agribusiness symposium held last spring in which nearly 100 representatives of land-grant colleges, industry, and the agricultural press met to diagnose the illness of agricultural education and to prescribe a cure. The symposium, sponsored by the Foundation for American Agriculture, promises to have far-reaching effects.

Because of the significance of the article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NEEDED: A BROADER AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

More than three centuries after the soil of this continent was first tilled by the white settlers, and 99 years after the establishment of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the ancient simple business of farming has become big industry, its gears meshing with



those of virtually every other industry in the Nation.

There is a word, "agribusiness," familiar to some people though still strange to many, which expresses this farm-industry interlock. This concept of agribusiness, as an extension of the traditional meaning of agriculture, is essential to the subject of this report.

Factors contributing to this metamorphosis of farming are familiar history. The vast upsurge of population brought a parallel increase in the need for food and fiber. New knowledge of chemistry and engineering, growing out of the so-called industrial revolution of 1850-1950, was applied to agriculture, and where 1 bushel of corn or wheat once grew, 3 or 4 grow today. Indeed, since 1950, one of our great agricultural problems has been overabundance, surpluses so huge that extraordinary measures have been instituted to reduce them.

It is doubtless a technologic triumph that this tremendously swollen output of farm crops is the work of fewer farms and farmers. In 1860, about 80 percent of the entire U.S. labor force was tilling the soil. In other words, 8 men fed and clothed 10—themselves and 2 others. What the other two did is of little concern to us, but almost certainly they were in some line of business that directly or obliquely touched agriculture. They didn't think of it as "agribusiness," but likely that is what it was.

By 1860, the segment of the population engaged in farming had dropped to 59 percent, and by 1910 to 35 percent. In 1930 the figure was 25 percent, and by 1959 only 12 percent of the total U.S. working force was producing all the food and fiber we needed, plus towering surpluses of corn, wheat and other crops. Instead of 8 men feeding and clothing 10, 12 men were now performing these vital services for 100, with plenty to spare.

This huge industry which is modern agriculture grosses nearly \$34 billion a year. Chiefly responsible for this production are about one million so-called "commercial" farms which account for somewhat more than 90 percent of our agricultural output. These one million farms have an estimated average investment of about \$100,000, an annual gross income of over \$30,000, and a net income of \$10,000. On some of the big ultramodern farming plants, employing a degree of automation equal to that in many industries, these averages for investment, annual gross and net, are multiplied several times.

Then superimpose upon this vast design the new concept of agriculture. In all its relations to industry. This is agribusiness, defined as "the sum total of all the operations involved in producing a farm commodity and getting it to the ultimate consumer in its final form." A simple definition, yet its implications are virtually boundless. It encompasses the processing of farm commodities into hundreds of food and nonfood products, and the marketing of same. It entails the production and sale of basic farm supplies: machinery, feed, seed, fertilizer, chemicals, farm building materials, and all else that today's agricultural plant needs to stay in business and make a profit. Even banking and insurance, as they relate to farm financing and farm protection, come under the aegis of agribusiness.

In all its ramifications, agribusiness is said to be a \$100 billion industry, employing 35 percent of the Nation's labor force. As such, agribusiness offers 15,000 skilled jobs a year.

You would suppose that an agro-industry complex of these dimensions would attract youth, particularly farm youth who have the background, the heritage, the tradition of agriculture in their blood. Considering the opportunity, and the availability of education, with a land-grant college in

every State, you might even expect that the country boys and city boys too would be jamming the entrance gates of every institution that teaches agriculture.

On the contrary, as someone once said of a Broadway play, they are staying away in droves. In 1948, according to the Stanford Research Institute, 391,656 students were enrolled in our land-grant colleges. Of these, 45,853, or 11.7 percent, were taking agricultural courses. In 1959, total land-grant college enrollment had climbed a little to 411,437, but numbers of ag students had dropped to 31,722, or 7.7 percent. Agricultural degrees granted in 1950 numbered 10,908; in 1958 (latest year of record) the total of 5,525 agricultural degrees was barely one-half of the figure 8 years previously. Among total college enrollment in the United States today, the agricultural colleges can claim only 1.5 percent.

In the face of agribusiness's annual 15,000-job demand, the agricultural colleges are currently graduating about enough to fill one-third of the potential. If this trend continues, the ag colleges will be graduating only 3,000 by 1970, or enough to fill one-fifth of the agribusiness positions that will be crying for trained men.

Accompanying this decline in numbers there is evidence that the ag students' average ability is below that of students in other fields. Among nearly 500,000 male college students taking the Army general classification test, both the entering freshmen and graduating seniors in agriculture were next to the lowest among groups which included business, economics, education, engineering, history, the humanities and arts, law, natural sciences, psychology, and social sciences.

Other investigations, on more limited bases in various parts of the country, tend to confirm the findings of the Army general classification test.

#### IS AGRICULTURE BEING SOLD SHORT TO YOUTH?

What's behind this apparent disinterest of young men, particularly the brightest young men, in careers in agriculture and its related industries? Is agricultural education falling behind its obligation, failing to recognize its modern challenge?

This question is currently of deep concern to educators and to business firms which process farm crops or manufacture the vital materials of modern farming. These industries desperately need chemists, engineers, food technologists, economists, salesmen, and marketing experts. Particularly they need those who have, underlying their specialty, an agricultural background. Only the ag colleges can supply that essential thing.

The ag colleges are teaching agriculture but, in the view of the agribusiness firms, few of them are teaching all the rest that is integral to and inseparable from agriculture today. The combination, the nice balance that agribusiness needs, is difficult to find.

So agribusiness goes elsewhere for its manpower—to the engineering, polytechnic, and business schools, to the non-ag courses of the State universities, and even to the liberal arts colleges.

Last spring, at the Michigan State University, East Lansing, nearly 100 representatives of land-grant colleges, industry, and the agricultural press, held a 3-day agribusiness symposium, under the sponsorship of the Foundation for American Agriculture, to diagnose the illness of agricultural education and to prescribe a cure.

This meeting, the first large-scale forum of its kind, served to crystallize a good deal of thinking on the part of industrial leaders and educators. Those gaps in agricultural teaching which now seem obvious to many were first recognized, several years ago, not by industry but by the universities themselves, specifically members of the agricultural division of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges. The East Lansing meeting

was a direct outgrowth of the initial vision of these men.

Many at this conference felt strongly that agriculture is being sold short to youth, that young men are being discouraged from agricultural careers by their families and their high school vocational advisers. If the image of agriculture has been bright in the past it is decidedly tarnished now in the youthful eye and in the minds of those who counsel the young on their careers and who fail to scent the infinite opportunity implicit in today's agricultural revolution.

Parents who have never farmed think of agriculture in terms that were obsolete decades ago—as a dull, laborious business lacking most of the cultural amenities, a career in which a man dedicates himself to a life-long wrestling match with intractable soil and stubborn livestock, gets manure on his shoes, and earns less in a year than he could earn as a bank clerk.

Even the parents who have farmed all their lives may present to their sons a dismal picture of agriculture as a calling. Those who have not succeeded, because of too little capital or land or knowledge, certainly cannot be shining examples of the promise of the farm life.

In too many high schools, as the critics see it, the vocational-agriculture course is a refuge for the lazy and dull, a comfortable escape from the sterner threats of the languages and higher mathematics. Other subjects are glamorized for youth; agriculture is held to be a plodding, hayseed enterprise, unlikely to provide enviable income or social position. Kids who are excited by the "status symbols" they believe to be attainable in business or science see little promise of such rewards in agriculture.

At the East Lansing meeting no group was above criticism—by itself or by others—for failing to present agriculture to youth as a dynamic and rewarding profession.

One spokesman noted that the Federal Government itself acts as if it were ignorant of the need to inspire farm youth to stay on the farm, or to seek careers in the many businesses which deal directly with the farm. The Bureau of the Census publishes a discouragingly low average per capita income for farmworkers 14 years old and over, and those who read this sort of statistic decide that almost any other enterprise is more promising. What the Bureau doesn't say is that all so-called farms are included in this dismal average. A farm, in the Bureau's 1959 lexicon, can be any rural or suburban venture that cultivates less than 10 acres and sells \$250 worth of produce a year. If it's 10 acres or more, the yearly sales need be only \$50, as if mere acreage, not the yield therefrom, constitutes a farm. What the Government statisticians should emphasize to the upcoming generation of farmers and agribusiness technicians is that 1 million family farms net close to \$10,000 each, annually, and offer a comparable market for the products of industry.

Even among industry—the agribusiness firms—there is a broad area of indifference to the need for expansion of curriculums in agricultural courses, despite an acute awareness of this need on the part of a few agribusiness leaders. Some spokesmen for the colleges, at the East Lansing conference, felt that industry has not made known just what it expects in ag-college graduates, and should be more specific in citing its career opportunities. This bouquet was handed back to the colleges by an industry representative who urged that the colleges make greater efforts to learn the requirements of agribusiness. He further suggested that an industry committee to counsel the agricultural colleges on curricula would help attain this end.

Other proposals included periodic industry-college seminars, industry-sponsored scholarships for ag students, and one-the-



job training in industry for superior undergraduates.

Generally, it was felt that agricultural-college curriculums should be broadened to utilize the full resources of the university, including colleges of business, engineering, and the liberal arts. A serious imbalance was seen in the fact that while all educational facilities are in short supply, and many universities cannot accept more than a small fraction of their applicants, agricultural-education facilities are not being fully utilized.

There was unanimous agreement on the need to attract youth to farming and agribusiness careers at the high-school stage of their education. While the 4-H Clubs recognize the importance of acquainting youth with the "total agricultural enterprise," high schools are manifesting widespread ignorance of the career opportunities. Traditionally, most ag-college students have come from the rural high schools, hence it is particularly important that the city schools know what the agricultural colleges can offer.

The sort of curriculums that agribusiness wants would benefit equally the student who intends to farm. Mere production, in farming as in business, is held to be an obsolete ideal. Formerly industry made what it could out of its raw materials and sold the resulting products for whatever they would bring in the markets open to them. Today, industry thinks first of potential new markets which a new product might supply. If the market analysis warrants, the new product is made. Agriculture should do just that, indeed has done so many times. The science of genetics is back of many strains of corn, wheat, and other crops that were unknown a generation ago. Research in animal and poultry nutrition and husbandry has, in effect, created markets for improved livestock and poultry products. Modern farming is in itself big business, demanding a high order of skill in the chemistry and engineering of crop production, and the economics of marketing and purchasing.

#### ARE WE BLUNTING OUR BEST COLD-WAR WEAPON?

Here and there in this discussion you can hear notes of alarm for America's continued world leadership in agriculture. Our supremacy in this field, long acknowledged, is held by some to be jeopardized. Russia may be ahead of us in satellite technology and moon-probing, but she is far behind us in the vital business of producing food and fiber.

While the Communist world is fighting a desperate agricultural shortage, our greatest farm problem is how to control a superabundance of crops. The attempt has cost us some \$20 billion in the last 20 years, yet the Communists would gladly swap their own agricultural headache for ours.

Agribusiness points out that U.S. industry can be largely credited for our world-beating agriculture. Industry manufactures the tools of farm-crop production, supports millions of dollars worth of basic research in agriculture annually, and affords huge markets for the harvested crops. Russia does not yet have equally broad markets for her farm commodities or comparable ability to produce the essential materials of modern farming.

America's knowledge of agriculture is a doubly potent weapon because it can be imparted to the underdeveloped and underfed countries which are still undecided whether communism or the West offers the better way of life.

Yet some thoughtful men have expressed a real fear that this keenest of our cold war weapons may become blunt and rusty if agricultural-education standards are allowed to decline.

#### AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AND AGRIBUSINESS

"Agribusiness" is a new word, yet all that it expresses is almost as old as agriculture itself. The first tiller of the soil who bought a hoe, or who sold some of his harvest instead of consuming it all himself, was engaged in a primitive form of agribusiness.

The huge complexity of the farm-industry relationship today, however, does seem to warrant a word. "Agribusiness" is a useful and expressive one. In the opinion of this writer, however, it should not be employed chiefly to glamorize agriculture in the youthful mind. For agriculture is still a respected word and a respected occupation, deserving the best education to be had. Indeed a sound agricultural education, embracing all the aspects of agribusiness, will prepare youth for many kinds of rewarding careers and thus attract the students who today go elsewhere.

Offering these added curriculums, the traditional institution of the agricultural college need not become, through any distortion of emphasis or terminology, a college of agribusiness.

#### WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

Agriculture and the industries concerned with it want a review of ag-education capabilities. In this desire they are far from unique. Huge private grants have been made by various sources for the evaluation of curricula and teaching procedures in other fields. Engineering, for example, has benefited by a \$21 million study, and the physical sciences have been granted nearly \$9 million. For the study of other professions—the arts, law, education, social sciences, administration, and business—various foundations have provided funds ranging from \$330,000 to \$7½ million. Agriculture, that most basic of all human endeavors, is conspicuous by its absence from this list.

A program for such a study, costing approximately half a million dollars, has been drawn up in detail by the Stanford Research Institute and submitted to a committee of the Division of Agriculture, American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.

This survey of ag-education shortcomings and how to start, at least, to correct them, was made under the direction of the Farm Film Foundation, the Foundation for American Agriculture, the Land-Grant College Agribusiness Subcommittee, and a special Operations Committee composed of farm and business leaders.

The Agribusiness Symposium in East Lansing last March brought together for the first time a broad representation of agriculture and industry, the men who best understand the concept of agribusiness and its educational needs. Out of the organized discussions at this meeting, and others of its kind which will follow (or perhaps out of the mind and heart and energy of one man or a few men), agricultural education should acquire whatever scope and depth it needs to meet the demands of the future.

### The Changing World

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by David Lawrence, editor and publisher of the U.S. News & World Report, is an excellent review of

the rapidly changing conditions in the world with particular reference to the present struggle between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies.

#### THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By David Lawrence)

To recall what one saw here in Europe just after both World Wars and to review the mistakes made in the two reconstruction periods is worthwhile only if it indicates what may lie ahead today.

For, while this is a constantly changing world, history repeats itself often. Things do not remain static, of course, because hundreds of millions of energetic, restless, intelligent individuals strive constantly to attain new goals.

Each generation prides itself on its triumphs. Reading the other day a book of the 1850's written as a diary by a New York lawyer, this correspondent noted the emotional enthusiasm of those times as an Atlantic cable was successfully laid, establishing instantaneous communication for the first time between Europe and America. The event had far more practical meaning than an orbital flight in space has today, and it has had a more lasting effect to date on the welfare of mankind. For better and better communication between people is still the main essential of human progress.

In retrospect, the lessons of history have often been ignored. We didn't settle World War I equitably, and we failed in the 1920's to mobilize economic aid to help the Weimar Republic in Germany to become stable. Instead, a dictatorship there took advantage of the economic chaos. Had we come forth in the 1920's with something like the Marshall plan, World War II might well have been averted.

Then, after the Second World War, we failed to assure self-government to the peoples in Eastern Europe. Certainly we have learned the lesson that economic development is a prerequisite to peace and stability. But we haven't solved the problem of a society caught in the meshes of a fanatical ideology, as in Soviet Russia, where millions of human beings are prevented from enjoying the fruits of their own labor.

Will the group of tyrants who dominate the Soviet Union and control its whole life make the same colossal error that the expansionists of previous decades made? Their threat to world peace is reminiscent of the passion of the Kaiser's demagogues as they cried out for more territory and resources for a rapidly growing population. Have we forgotten nazism's expansion into Austria and the Balkans by military force? Its counterpart today is international communism on the march in every continent.

Materialism is its basic motive. It seeks to benefit the few—not the people as a whole. The battle in Africa is for the control of natural resources, including the oil of the Sahara. In the Middle East and in Latin America, rich resources are also at stake.

The new formula for economic progress in Western Europe—the Common Market—on the other hand, gives promise of a rising prosperity on the European Continent.

The reconstruction of Western Europe with the aid of America's funds has been a notable achievement. It is heartening in contrast with the scenes of destruction in each of the two World Wars. For today the streets are filled with automobiles—signs of a more rapid system of communication inside every country. New construction is going on everywhere. There is increased commerce, relatively little unemployment, and certainly more enjoyment of the recreational side of life. Poverty has been lessened. Street beggars are rare. There are indications of a better and better life.

What shall we say then of the war clouds that hover constantly over us? This is a



constant reminder that greed, the lust for political power, and the desire to control millions of other human beings have not vanished. Weapons of war grow in number and power, while large armies, navies, and air forces—offensive and defensive—train for the war that mankind does not want. It is hoped that the very destructive power of nuclear weapons as a means of inflicting incalculable damage to both sides may push a big war farther and farther away.

Today peoples are better informed than ever before. Communication is better than at any time in human history. In this fact lies the hope of tomorrow.

But we fail to express ourselves adequately and effectively. A babble of voices marks our diplomacy. Alliances are cumbersome and difficult to coordinate.

Ideals, however, are not hard to articulate. For dictatorships are not invulnerable. The peoples under Communist thought control are still intelligent human beings who know the difference between freedom and slavery. Oppression does eventually breed revolt, and even the best-trained armies turn someday on their own tyrannical rulers.

The quest for life, liberty, and happiness is never ending. Today in Eastern Europe that quest is slowly but surely manifesting itself in widespread unrest. Simultaneously, on the other side of the Iron Curtain, we are witnessing a successful realization of what freedom can really mean in advancing the economic and social well-being of the human race.

### Flow of Communist Propaganda Into the United States

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and others on the floor of the House yesterday—pages 16702-16708—with respect to the flow of Communist propaganda into the United States, came as a very great source of satisfaction to me.

The matter to which the gentleman has spoken by the introduction of his bill which would curtail this flow, not only affects the future security of the United States but, so long as it is tolerated, reflects the kind of intellectual confusion which militates against us by inviting international Communists to overreach. I intend, of course, to support the bill, but I should like to introduce into the RECORD a copy of a letter which I have received from Mr. John J. Minges, a distinguished citizen of Iowa's Second District, a school superintendent who understands that in the making of an American, and in the making of an effective worker in the cause of freedom, believing is no less important than knowing:

COGSON COMMUNITY

SCHOOL DISTRICT,

Cogson, Iowa, June 8, 1961.

HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROMWELL: Recently I received two back copies of the magazine U.S.S.R.,

which apparently originated in the Russian Embassy, 1706 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

The magazine purports to be sent on a reciprocal agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, in return for which we are entitled to send the Amerika to the Soviet Union. I don't know what postal arrangements were made, but it appears to me that this is not the type of publication to be sent to the schools in the United States. It is obviously highly tainted with propaganda in its nature.

Particularly offensive was the article which appeared in the September issue of the said magazine dealing with a religious theme which would give the American student the idea that Christianity or religion in general is a basic part of Russian life when, in fact, all of our intelligence reports indicate that the opposite is true.

I presume that we have no way of preventing this type of literature from finding its way to the news stands, but I would certainly question permitting this type of material to be sent to the schools in the United States.

As a veteran of World War II and in the Korean conflict and a member of the Active Reserve for nearly 20 years, I feel that my patriotism is above reproach, and after reading several of the articles in the above-mentioned magazine, I was tempted to seek Soviet citizenship and enjoy some of the benefits which they so glowingly describe.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. MINGES.

### The So-Called Hanford Powerplant Compromise Is a Sham and for That Reason the House of Representatives Should Stand Fast by Refusing To Accept It

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure every Member of the House of Representatives realizes, the conferees on the AEC authorization bill met yesterday and decided to try to force a half a loaf of Hanford on the House of Representatives. As the minority manager on the part of the House I have refused to sign the conference report because in my opinion it is still contrary to the instruction clearly and emphatically given to the House conferees by a vote of 235 to 164 to stand firm in opposition to the Hanford electric generating project. The proposal to authorize \$58 million for the construction of one 400,000-kilowatt unit is a feeble attempt to dilute the effectiveness of the position the House has taken on three previous votes. This so-called compromise—even with the proviso that the electric energy be used exclusively at the Hanford station—is like saying, "Let's compromise, you give me half your beer and I'll give you half my foam."

We have often heard it said that half a loaf is better than none. But, I can assure you that in this situation half a no-good loaf to begin with is substantially worse than none.

Mr. Speaker, never in my many years of legislature experience have I seen such a loose treatment of facts and figures in an attempt to get congressional authorization for a project as I have seen in this Hanford situation. Two years of intensive study went into the original proposal to add electric generating facilities to the new production reactor at Hanford. Two years were required because several different studies with varying assumptions had to be made before the proponents could come up with one which might barely pass the test of economic feasibility. In fact, the Joint Committee report on the original project stated on page 8:

The economics of NPR (during the power only operation) are about break even or moderately favorable (depending on bases and assumptions).

Therefore, it stands to reason that to increase the cost per kilowatt of installed capacity at Hanford by almost 22 percent—and that its exactly what happens when one constructs a 400,000-kilowatt station for \$58 million—the economic feasibility obviously must be much worse. But again, we find the assumption jugglers busily engaged in trying to find a combination of secret assumptions which might make the project appear feasible. It will be noted from the conference report that they even had to increase the assumed plutonium production campaign by 3 years to accomplish their desired ends.

The majority conferees list four so-called advantages which they claim would accrue from the authorization of the single electric generator facility at Hanford. Let us examine these so-called advantages to determine whether they will stand up under the searching light of evaluation:

1. All of the electric power produced at the facility will be used for national defense purposes at the AEC Hanford plutonium weapons material production installation.

This is a true statement as far as it goes but it does not actually reflect what effect the project will have on national defense. At this time in our national history when we are engaged in a national defense spending program, unprecedented in our history, it would be foolhardy to dissipate this effort by spending \$58 million to produce 400,000 kilowatts of electric power, even to be consumed at Hanford, which could be purchased more economically through the existing arrangements with the power suppliers. It is not sufficient to maintain that it "would be used for national defense purposes" when it is clearly demonstrated that the net effect would be to diminish the effectiveness of the defense effort.

2. Since the electric power production is limited to the AEC Hanford installation, the question of whether or not AEC would be in the commercial power business is completely eliminated.

This is one of the most blatant attempts to mislead and to confuse the basic issue contained in the conference report. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 specifically requires that power may be produced incidentally in research and development reactors or production



facilities. It cannot be argued that the addition of 400,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity is incidental, but rather it becomes a major purpose of this facility. The fact remains that an equal amount of power which was previously supplied to Hanford would be released into the Bonneville system to add to the existing surplus in the Pacific Northwest. The fact remains that this additional surplus of 400,000 kilowatts would be used as a justification for the proposed Federal intertie between Bonneville and California as the first leg on an all-Federal giant power grid. The fact remains that public power planners already have on the drafting board plans to construct other Federal powerplants and transmission lines to compete with existing power suppliers.

Since the conference report assumes an 11-year plutonium production campaign at Hanford, one may ask whether it is also assumed that Hanford will not be required for plutonium production after 1973. If this be the case, what will become of the 400,000 kilowatts of power in this reactor at that time?

3. The Hanford atomic electric plant at 400,000 kilowatts would still be the world's largest atomic powerplant from a single reactor.

It might be further stated—as was pointed out during the previous debate on the original proposal—that this would also be the world's most ridiculous example of obsolete, outmoded, and retrogressive engineering. There can be little benefit gained either technologically or in world prestige by wasting critically needed taxpayers' dollars to build an antique teakettle.

There is no doubt that the United States already enjoys the world's leadership in development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We do not have to make ourselves appear to be foolishly striving for bigness, regardless of the contribution which such bigness might make in the refinement of reactor technology.

4. Economic studies submitted by the Atomic Energy Commission indicate that the entire capital cost of the generating facility will be paid for with interest in 9 years of dual-purpose operation.

I have already addressed myself to this point in the first part of my remarks. For this reason, I think it will be sufficient merely to reiterate that the increase in cost per kilowatt of installed capacity of almost 22 percent in this new proposal would certainly have an adverse effect on the economics of the proposition which the House has three times rejected.

Mr. Speaker, the attempts of the conferees to force half a Hanford loaf on the House of Representatives in no way negates the 10 compelling reasons listed in the separate statement attached to the Joint Committee report on the original AEC authorization bill and the position previously taken by the House of Representatives. Under the circumstances, I sincerely urge my colleagues in this body to rise in even greater force to announce that they will not tolerate such a complete disregard of the need for economy at a time when we are already

involved in the most expensive defense effort we have ever undertaken. I feel it is the responsibility which every one of us has to our constituents and to the Nation to assure the most prudent and effective expenditure of Federal funds. The Hanford proposal contained in the conference report is indeed a question of waste. However, it is not a question of wasting steam, but a question of wasting more precious Federal dollars.

### School Aid Debacle

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest that the New York Times in an editorial today agreed with many of us who took issue with the procedure involved in attempting to bring up an inadequate, hybrid education measure under Calendar Wednesday procedure. The Times editorial properly dubs the collapse of education legislation for public schools as a "tragic end to a chapter of legislative irresponsibility and inept Executive leadership." It goes on to point out that "much of the burden of the defeat remains on those who mismanaged the measure," and on "inept behind-the-scenes talk of compromise."

The editorial correctly points out that the use of the Calendar Wednesday procedure "lost even the support of some honest advocates of Federal aid," and noted that "The totally new bill, based on a distribution formula different from earlier measures, had to be voted on within 1 day, without proper study or debate."

No further comment is needed on one important sentence in the editorial:

This leaves room for suspicion that some of those who adopted this dubious procedure were more interested in going through the motions and clearing themselves of responsibility than in having school aid enacted.

The editorial is included in its entirety, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 1, 1961]

#### SCHOOL AID DEBACLE

Satisfactory Federal aid to the public schools, although solemnly promised in both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms and labeled with highest priority by the Kennedy administration, has been killed beyond hope for revival in this session of Congress. This is the tragic end to a chapter of legislative irresponsibility and inept Executive leadership.

Inevitably, the post mortems will allocate the blame to everyone's political advantage. The fact is that the blame must be shared across party boundaries. The bipartisan anti-aid coalition, of course, did its best to exploit every extraneous controversy. The parochial school issue was welcomed by those who gladly use any means to obstruct aid to public education.

But much of the burden of the defeat remains on those who mismanaged the measure. Inept behind-the-scenes talk of compromise, particularly the offer to use the National Defense Education Act as a vehicle

for backdoor aid to nonpublic schools, consolidated the opposition and disheartened supporters. The bill that was held captive in the Rules Committee was sound. It was worth a far greater effort for rescue. It needed the urgency of pressure from the White House and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; instead it received offers of soft compromise.

When the inadequate hybrid measure was finally brought to the floor under the Calendar Wednesday procedure it lost even the support of some honest advocates of Federal aid. The totally new bill, based on a distribution formula different from earlier measures, had to be voted on within 1 day, without proper study or debate. This leaves room for suspicion that some of those who adopted this dubious procedure were more interested in going through the motions and clearing themselves of responsibility than in having school aid enacted.

There remains, however, another issue of overriding importance. As a result of the political horse-trading, extension of the vital National Defense Education Act has not yet been voted. Without such extension the colleges will not be able to offer loans to this year's high school seniors. Nor will academic institutions be able to plan effective science, mathematics, language, and fellowship programs, with any assurance of continuity. Enough damage has already been done through the failure to enact public school aid; it must not be compounded by failure to extend the entire NDEA before Congress adjourns.

### Look South

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Southern Railway System in the following article very vividly points out the fantastic growth and development of the South. This article recently appeared in many nationally circulated publications:

#### HOW DOES THE FUTURE LOOK TO YOU?

Your outlook on the future can well depend on where you look to see it. Especially is this true in these highly competitive times, when profits everywhere are much harder to come by. So, we say again to profit-minded businessmen—don't despair. If you have set your sights on a prosperous and rewarding industrial future, look South now to find it.

You will be in good company. Last year, along the lines of Southern Railway alone, there were 372 new industrial developments representing an investment of almost half a billion dollars—greater than any year since 1956. Among these are industries of all kinds and sizes, all looking for the same thing—increased inplant production efficiency plus fast-growing markets nearby, to absorb the goods they make at a reasonable profit to the manufacturer.

Why not let a member of our industrial development department give you the facts and the figures about your prospects for the future in the modern South? No obligation, of course—and in complete confidence. Call or write today.

Look ahead—look South.

A recent U.S. Department of Commerce report shows the modern South leading the national rate-of-growth average in 29 of the



34 fields of business activity covered. Here are examples:

	Percent Increase	
	For the South	For the United States
Dollar value added by manufacture...	120	90
Number of manufacturing establishments	35	24
Manufacturing employment	28	12
Dollar value of manufacturing payrolls	131	97
New plant and equipment expenditures	65	49
Dollar value of retail sales	65	53
Number of retail trade establishments	5	1
Dollar value of retail trade payrolls	77	59
Dollar value of wholesale sales	68	50
Number of wholesale establishments	36	17
Wholesale trade employment	23	13
Dollar value of wholesale trade payrolls	80	59
Number of service trade establishments	58	46
Number of industrial and commercial firms	29	13
Dollar value of life insurance in force	253	172
Number of motor vehicle registrations	117	91
Dollar value of bank deposits	73	58
Production of electric energy	238	158
Dollar value of personal income	111	101
Per capita personal income	74	64
Dollar value of minerals produced	87	70
Cash farm income	23	10

### The Big Prison

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about the Berlin crisis and its effect on the peace and people of the world.

In the August 28, 1961, issue of U.S. News & World Report an excellent article entitled "The Big Prison," by David Lawrence appears.

This article was brought to my attention by a patriotic citizen and friend, Henry A. Spindler, of Wood-Ridge, N.J.

Because of the universal interest in Berlin and Germany at this time, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

#### THE BIG PRISON

(By David Lawrence)

EUROPE.—More than 17 million persons were imprisoned a few days ago in East Germany.

They have committed no crime. They have not trespassed upon any other people's territory. They are nevertheless confined within borders prescribed by their Communist masters. Armed guards patrol the barbed-wire and concrete barriers erected to prevent their leaving the big prison.

Across a line through the city of Berlin are many relatives and friends whom they are forbidden to visit.

Alone and unbefriended by any other nation, the East German people suffer in silence—unable to express their will and bound by the mandate of their oppressors not to dare to depart to other countries or even to other parts of their own German homeland.

The world has not often witnessed in our times such a colossal act of cruelty.

In these days when self-determination is the rallying cry of millions of persons in

Africa, many of them not yet fit for self-government, the majority of nations have given more than lipservice to the idea that colonialism should be abolished and independence granted.

But where are the champions of the imprisoned millions in East Germany? Do the Afro-Asian members of the United Nations lift their voices in protest or demand special meetings of the General Assembly to seek justice for the 17 million prisoners—educated human beings who obviously deserve a chance to govern themselves? And what do we in America or our friends in Western Europe do about it?

Timidly and with a mistaken belief that it is important not to offend Nikita Khrushchev, the American Government's broadcasts to East Germany tell the people there to be calm and to do nothing to bring about disturbances of any kind. This is advice based on our own alleged self-interest. But it is really a form of appeasement reminiscent of the days of Munich.

Here, for instance, is an extract from an editorial published in the New York Times of August 16 and transmitted by the various press services to the newspapers of Europe:

"While the Soviets seek to stir up revolution and war against us wherever they can—even to the perfidy of the Hitler-Stalin pact—we must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must, under our principles, live with evil even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citadels of freedom, like West Berlin, to slow death by strangulation."

Does this expression by one of the leading newspapers of the United States represent the thinking of the American people today? Have we forgotten the ideals of yesteryears—the many words of sympathy we have written into the platforms of both of our political parties in decades past as we openly took our stand by the side of oppressed peoples?

Do we really mean to remain passive now lest we offend the Communist? Will this not embolden them to take further steps—perhaps the next time to imprison the people of West Berlin, too?

For if we are obsessed with fears and afflicted with a defeatism which makes us afraid even to encourage other peoples to seek their freedom, then the Soviet Union need have no concern about trespassing further on human rights.

The West Germans are plainly disappointed that their Western allies have indicated their aloofness toward the problem of the East German people. Small wonder that it was deemed necessary by President Kennedy to send Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON to West Berlin to help bolster the morale of the people there.

True enough, nobody wants to see any incitement to war. But wars come from timorousness, and not from resoluteness.

The Soviet Union has committed a major crime in imprisoning the people of East Germany. Will the people of the West fail to speak up against this act of inhumanity?

Diplomatic notes of protest are not enough. Throughout the United States and other Western countries days of mourning should be proclaimed as millions of freemen go to their churches to pray to God to give the East German people the strength to rise up against their captors and emerge from their enslavement.

Demonstrations in all parts of the world should be held immediately so that there can be recorded the protest of a shocked humanity.

For communism, which boasts of its prowess in science and pledges great achievements in economic fields, reveals its true character as it denies human beings their

freedom and their individual liberties.

The verdict of the world must be registered, and the United States should take the lead in denouncing the unjustified imprisonment of 17 million human beings behind the walls of imperialistic communism.

### The European Common Market Challenge to the United States: Christian Science Monitor Comments on Analysis of Congressman Henry S. Reuss

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOHN BRADEMAS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article in the August 30, 1961, issue of the Christian Science Monitor concerning the challenge of the European Common Market as a new monetary power in the world today.

The article contains an exceptionally interesting analysis of the views of our distinguished colleague, Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, concerning the present monetary balance in the free world.

The article follows:

#### FRAGILE MONETARY BALANCE

(By Nate White, business and financial editor of the Christian Science Monitor)

BOSTON.—The free world's delicate monetary balance is poised on eggs. A single slip could destroy it.

In many respects the monetary balance is the most fragile part of the alliance of the North Atlantic community. It exists without treaty, without formal, signed, legal agreements.

This monetary balance is ad hoc. This means that the moves to maintain it are literally "played by ear."

It seems incredible that the monetary security of the free world hangs thus by a thread, dependent totally on the good will, unselfishness, and cooperation of those concerned.

An ad hoc balance is better than all-out monetary warfare. It is a step removed from the monetary jungle of the late 19th century and early 20th up to 1933. It succeeds at all only because sophisticated persons are working hard to maintain it.

Yet it is fragile, as fragile as eggs or a spider's web. Last year it was nearly demolished. Again this spring it was nearly torn down.

The monetary balance is the most sensitive problem the United States faces among its allies. In many respects the monetary security of the United States is in their hands. A rip in this ad hoc alliance fabric could destroy or seriously weaken the superimposed military alliance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

If the Soviet Union could upset this sensitive balance, it could achieve a greater economic victory than it ever could do with its clumsy Berlin-type bludgeoning.

The monetary ad hoc balance is the economic Achilles heel of the free nations.

It is doubtful if the Soviets are clever enough to upset this balance by themselves. They are accumulating gold, probably more rapidly than any other nation today. Their gold wealth is not known, but it is believed



to be between \$8 billion and \$12 billion. The Soviets have gold in their hills, and they have goldiggers combing them, panning them, and flushing them in search of the yellow stuff which has become the nation's symbol of solvency.

Yet, even with their gold, the Soviets cannot upset the free balance unless the members of the free balance themselves permit imbalance to occur.

Here is the risk and the rub.

Citizens of the prosperous United States—its buoyant consumers—know little, if anything, of the great wide world of international monetary exchange. They never have concerned themselves with it. In Britain where international trade is the vital source of prosperity the average Briton knows about his country's vital reserves in the balance of trade. The enthusiasm or solemnity of the country goes up and down with the reserves.

A Briton knows that if the nation's reserves in international exchanges are dropping, the country faces a little greater austerity at home. This is what is happening now.

The average American knows hardly anything about his country's reserves and cares less.

Yet he must learn about them if he is to understand the influences which are operating today which directly affect his own daily existence.

The Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress has just published the hearings and analysis of the free world's exchange and payments arrangements which its subcommittee under Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, conducted. These reports (one costing \$1 and the second 15 cents from the Government Printing Office) contain a thorough analysis of the problems and of the several proposed solutions to the monetary problem, especially as they affect great trading nations such as Britain and the United States.

Representative REUSS, incidentally, is one of the most alert Members of the Congress on this problem. He is an outstanding, forthright liberal, in the true sense of the term, who thought of the Peace Corps, who led congressional debates for cultural programs in television and radio, and who has spoken frequently for Kennedy administration programs in the Congress.

Yet Representative REUSS is far ahead of the administration on the world exchange balance and is more accurate in his analysis of the problem than any Member of Congress. He is well out in front, far ahead of Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, who, first in the Eisenhower administration and now in the Kennedy administration, has not told the American people what the European Common Market may mean to them as thoroughly as has Representative REUSS. Nor have other members of the Kennedy administration, such as George Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, correctly presented the picture.

Mr. REUSS has had the courage to tell the administration in a speech in the House on August 7, 1961 (published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, No. 134, p. 13760), that it "has painted the United States into a corner." "Our U.S. officialdom is expressing its delight at the state of affairs," he said in reference to the administration's policy on the European Common Market.

Mr. REUSS sees in the European Common Market the climax of 1,200 years' effort to achieve a single empire in Europe, "going back to Charlemagne, the Holy Roman Empire, the grand design of Henry IV, the pan-European movement of Aristide Briand, and all the impetus toward European integration following World War II."

"But," Mr. REUSS asks, "was it necessary to divide the free world in two—Western Europe and its dependencies, on the one hand, and the rest of the West on the other—in order to obtain these economic and political benefits? The United States in Marshall plan days encouraged Western Europe to discriminate against U.S. goods because it was Western Europe that was suffering a severe deficit in payments. Yet now that the shoe is on the other foot—now that it is the United States that faces the payments deficit, while most of Western Europe has a whopping surplus—we find ourselves still insisting on the Common Market and on the expansion of the discrimination against us by a host of additional countries.

"In short, we have encouraged a European particularism at just the stage in history when we should have been discouraging a European particularism in favor of a free world generalism."

President Kennedy himself gave Dr. Walter Hallstein, president of the European Common Market, the pledges of U.S. support. It was President Kennedy's desk-thumping insistence to Prime Minister Harold Macmillan which finally forced the British Prime Minister into the critical decision to try to integrate Britain with Europe. Instead of attempting to work creatively for a countervailing power of unity between the United States and Britain and the British Commonwealth, the youthful U.S. President slammed the door on an economic alliance with Britain.

Now the administration is trying to argue that its support of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation is its answer. Actually, the OECD was a British idea, advanced first by Sir Oliver Franks, and seized upon by Mr. Dillon, then an Eisenhower aid, because the U.S. administration was bankrupt of a program of its own.

But reports from Europe now indicate that the new economic power of the European Common Market is growing so rapidly that the new OECD, which comes into faint being in October, will have difficulty exercising a unifying or countervailing power.

Underneath all this is the sensitive monetary balance on thin eggshells.

The European Common Market today is the new monetary power of the world. Today this is seen by alert men such as Mr. REUSS, and, of course, the British are well aware of this development. In perhaps three years, barring a third world war, the power of this development will hit U.S. officials and citizens, when they realize they have moved themselves at their own momentum into a second-rate monetary status.

The gold of the European Common Market countries today exceeds that of the United States. As they move themselves progressively toward the new empire, a momentum which now has accumulative power, the new scenes will unfold so that all can see. Even now the franc is replacing the dollar in a small way as an international currency. If the franc becomes the currency of the new empire, the dollar progressively will take a back seat. The center of monetary power will no longer be New York. It will be Brussels or Paris. Thus, subtly, history changes while the actors in it seem hardly aware of the changes.

The present stage of the monetary balance is one of an ad hoc system which is rapidly growing out of date and becoming unworkable. This is simply an informal, nonbinding agreement among central bankers of Europe not to cash their dollars into gold or their sterling into gold.

Each dollar outside the United States is a check promising to pay in gold. Up to now European countries and central banks have been content to build their economies

on the credit system of the dollar without exchanging their dollar reserves for gold.

This is the ad hoc situation. No treaty, no legal arrangements, no binding pledges exist to preserve it.

As France, Italy, and West Germany grow in economic power so will the European Economic Community, the new empire envisaged by Dr. Hallstein.

## Return to God—A Way To Stop Khrushchev

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 15, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the announcement by Soviet Russia that it will resume nuclear weapons testing, I should like to make the following comment:

The Communist devil has come out of hiding. It has cast off the mask of its sheeps' clothing.

I believe the U.S.S.R. has been secretly working on the huge nuclear bomb she is talking about which has a power equal to 100 million tons of TNT or 5,000 times bigger than the bomb which destroyed Hiroshima. Now she must make open tests to prove them out.

Khrushchev probably feels that he is now ready for the kill and is not afraid of exposure nor diverse public opinion. He must think that this is the hour to scare both the powerful and the weak nations into submitting to Russia's demands on Berlin and anywhere else in the world she chooses to strike. Even now both Russia and Red China talk of peace while they prepare to swallow up the world.

But there is one thing that can stop these godless countries and that is true moral and spiritual rearmament of humanity everywhere. Only a superior ideology, based on faith, morality, genuine freedom, and righteousness for all, can be effective and bring real peace to a tormented world. Military, economic, and political means are important, but they alone will not suffice.

If ever I believed in this cause, I believe in it now with all my heart. This is the time to unite the world by rearming all peoples with the moral and spiritual strength of our Saviour, who alone crushed the invincible but godless Roman Empire. All nations, except atheistic Russia and China, will follow such leadership. The weapons are not made and never will be made to crush such a spirit.

If Russia wishes to use its deadly weapons she will have to use them now, before the whole world, imbued with the moral strength of religion and faith, will rise up against her. Even her own people, who still have a spark of humanity in them, will drive the devils out of their country.



**Rushing Into Khrushchev's Hands—  
Allies Seen Solving Kremlin's Problems  
by Eagerness for New Negotiations**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continued saber-rattling and deliberate violations of agreements being perpetrated by Soviet Dictator Khrushchev in the Berlin crisis, all responsible Western leaders agree that a firm stand is our first line of defense at the present time. It is, therefore, with considerable dismay that we reflect upon the decision of the Kennedy administration to rush into new negotiations with the Kremlin which, if the pattern of the past is followed, will result in major concessions by Western diplomats.

Certainly the concessions and blunders of Roosevelt and Truman are too tragic a chapter in our nation's diplomatic history to be so easily forgotten, and the mistaken spirit of Camp David is the most recent reminder of the failure of both compromise with communism and the failure of summit diplomacy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I for one wish to raise my voice against the confused, vacillating, wind-blown nature of our present foreign policy and urge that for once the President's State Department advisers take the pulse of the American public and stand firm, rather than to negotiate away our positions of strength.

Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, Columnist Constantine Brown, writing from Rome, discussed in a most effective manner the question of coming negotiations. Under leave granted, I insert in the Appendix of the Record this article entitled "Rushing Into Khrushchev's Hands."

**RUSHING INTO KHRUSHCHEV'S HANDS—ALLIES  
SEEN SOLVING KREMLIN'S PROBLEMS BY  
EAGERNESS FOR NEW NEGOTIATIONS**  
(By Constantine Brown)

**ROME, ITALY.**—The fear expressed some weeks ago by some realists in the political and military world that we would bail out Premier Khrushchev at a time when conditions in the Soviet Union and the satellite states were at their worst for him is now by way of being realized.

Despite President de Gaulle's definite opposition to the West's making overtures to the Kremlin for negotiation to solve the Berlin problem and other pending difficulties, Washington, London, and even Bonn are anxious for a summit meeting.

General de Gaulle's initial opposition to the Western powers' urging negotiation with Mr. Khrushchev was based on incontrovertible evidence that things in the U.S.S.R. were at their worst economically and at the same time the political and economic situation in East Germany had become desperate.

Under these conditions, General de Gaulle argued, why not let the Russians come to us and suggest that we meet to discuss not only Berlin but everything else? We would then be at a great advantage by condescending to talk with the Soviet boss. Our military strength (all panicky reports and ru-

mors about Russia's superiority notwithstanding) is such that the Russians would not dare pull the trigger.

This realistic French approach to the diplomatic crisis is shared by the military of the NATO. We definitely have the wherewithal to make the Russians pay dearly for any military attempt. And the Russian general staff is aware of this.

Mr. Khrushchev is a shrewd and stubborn man, however; before swallowing a bitter pill, he intended to try something against the West, as usual, by proxy. That something was to be Berlin where he decided to create a real brink, pitting the East Berlin government against the allies in West Berlin.

There were, according to responsible informants, two plans. One, the most daring and likely to cause a real explosion, was to order the East German forces to raid a sector (preferably not American) and take it over. Mr. Khrushchev is reported to have toyed with that idea as being the most spectacular. But it could have involved a shooting problem which could occur before the whole matter could be brought before the United Nations. The Russian generals reportedly said "Nyet."

The second plan, which was put into effect on the night of August 13, was then decided on. It involved less risk, especially if the closing of all communications between the Eastern and Western city was to be done by piecemeal. Mr. Khrushchev's expectations were fulfilled. The step-by-step measures taken by Walter Ulbricht after several days of discussions in Moscow with the Russians and the Prime Ministers of the satellite countries created only an academic reaction in Washington, London and Paris.

The closing of the avenues between free and Communist Berlin brought the usual meaningless protests. The frame of mind in Washington and London was there is nothing we can do about it except make diplomatic representations. Even the decision to send Vice President JOHNSON and token reinforcements was taken only after President Kennedy received agonizing cries from Chancellor Adenauer and Berlin Mayor Brandt to do something. But simultaneously with these gestures, Washington, London and Rome let it be known to the world that the situation was so tense and full of danger to the peace of the world that a meeting with Mr. Khrushchev at the earliest convenient time must be held. The Russian dictator had not miscalculated.

On the surface the Soviet Union is not directly involved. It is the "sovereign People's Republic of East Germany" which has taken the restrictive measures to defend herself against "espionage, saboteurs and black marketers." The Soviet Union, it was announced, stands firmly as usual behind her allies. A number of Red divisions were brought to the Russian zone and Marshal Ivan Konev, one of the heroes of the last war, was placed in command.

Today despite General de Gaulle's stubborn opposition to rushing to a summit conference, the betting in Europe is that the other powers will make their approach to the Kremlin boss. This will add another feather to his cap by having won another victory over the powerful West by his usual method of bluff and blackmail.

Perhaps at the time when the NATO was at its lowest ebb, such an attitude by the Western Powers might have been described as necessarily circumspect. But today when the Allied forces are strong—although not yet at their peak—and when there is a definite will in America and Europe to stop Mr. Khrushchev's nibbling tactics, this rush to negotiate appears from this side as ludicrous, especially when conditions in the Soviet Union are such that Mr. Khrushchev cannot pull the trigger.

**The First 7 Months: President Kennedy  
and the 87th Congress**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. JOHN BRADEMAs**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Record the text of my August newsletter dealing with the first 7 months of President Kennedy's administration and the 87th Congress.

The newsletter follows:

As the 87th Congress drives toward adjournment, I think you'll be interested in a summary of our first 7 months' work under the Kennedy administration. Here's how it looks from Washington:

Although the threat to Berlin is the major concern here, President Kennedy has made clear that his purpose is to bolster the Nation's strength in order to meet crises in other parts of the world as well. His speech on Berlin drew bipartisan support. Congress responded quickly to his call for \$3.5 billion for a military-civil defense buildup, authority to raise draft calls and order some Reserve units to active duty. By increasing our conventional forces, President Kennedy seeks to give us an alternative between surrender and nuclear war. He wants to demonstrate to Khrushchev that we mean to stand firm in Berlin and that we intend to negotiate from strength, not weakness, in other trouble spots of the world.

The Berlin crisis emphasizes the shift in attention of the administration from domestic to foreign problems. When the President took office in January, recession and unemployment were in the headlines. Then the Congo, Laos, Cuba, especially Berlin, changed that. As General MacArthur told the President during his recent visit, "Well, the chickens have come home to roost, and you happen to live in the chickenhouse." In spite of troubles abroad, Congress has made a record of solid achievement on domestic legislation in the first half-year of the administration.

Ten of the President's sixteen priority bills have been written into law. Five were requested in Mr. Kennedy's program for economic recovery and growth:

1. Thirteen-week extension of unemployment benefits.
2. Aid to needy children of jobless workers.
3. Area redevelopment program to encourage industry and jobs in hard-hit communities.
4. Increase in minimum wage to \$1.25 and extension of coverage to 3.5 million new workers.
5. Improved social security: Minimum pension raised from \$33 to \$40; more benefits for widows; male workers can now draw reduced benefits at age 62.

Other major requests now law: The program to curtail feed grain surpluses—which has sharply cut corn production—extended for 1 year. A new Office of International Travel to encourage foreign tourists to visit the United States. Seventy-three more Federal judgeships including two for Indiana via a bill I cosponsored with Senator HARTKE.

Also enacted: A highway bill which will finance, largely through new highway user taxes, completion of the Interstate and Defense Highway System by 1972 as scheduled.

An omnibus housing bill providing 35-year, 3-percent downpayment loans for low and moderate income houses and 20-year, limited interest loans up to \$10,000 for home im-



provement; 100,000 units of low-income housing; expansion of urban renewal to provide \$75 million for grants to States and localities for city planning; \$650 million in loans to local communities to help improve water, gas, and sewage plants; \$2.8 billion in loans to help colleges build dormitories and dining halls.

The pickup in the economy has economists saying we're out of the recession, another boom is possible. What worries those who support the Kennedy program for economic growth is this: The gain in jobs has been moderate despite the encouraging increase in output. More than 5 million Americans still can't find work. In our own Third District unemployment remains the No. 1 problem. July reports showed some 10,700 jobless in the South Bend-Mishawaka labor market alone. This amounts to 11.5 percent of the work force—highest percentage in Indiana. Coming months will tell whether we can reduce hard core unemployment, bring about the spurt in economic growth we need to maintain our industrial lead over the Communist world.

My greatest satisfaction this year has been to announce, jointly with Senator HARTKE, award of Federal contracts in the Third District worth more than \$50 million. Studebaker-Packard Corp. in June won contracts totaling over \$27 million for military trucks. Earlier, Studebaker-Packard was successful bidder to supply Federal civilian agencies with passenger cars worth \$4,480,321. Bendix-Mishawaka will do most of the work on a new \$20 million contract for the Navy's surface-to-air Typhoon missile. The project may ultimately run to hundreds of millions of dollars. I was glad also to lend a hand to the U.S. Rubber Mishawaka plant which recently won a contract for Polaris missile casings and, to consolidate operations, will transfer a department from Providence, R.I., to Mishawaka.

With foreign aid legislation prominent in the news, I think it essential to keep two major points in mind:

1. Without an adequate foreign aid program, an economic and political vacuum will be created in the underdeveloped nations which Communist imperialism will certainly fill.

2. Over 80 percent of U.S. foreign aid funds are spent right in this country for goods and services.

While I support President Kennedy's aid program, as I did President Eisenhower's, I feel very strongly that our foreign aid operations overseas should be conducted more efficiently and effectively. That's why I sent a letter on behalf of 30 House Democrats asking Foreign Aid Chief Henry Labouisse for detailed answers to four questions. Here's a New York Herald-Tribune article of August 7, 1961, concerning the letter:

**"FOREIGN AID BACKERS ASK END OF WASTE—SEEK ASSURANCES BY PROGRAM CHIEF"**

"WASHINGTON, August 6.—Thirty House Democratic supporters of President Kennedy's \$8.8 billion long-range foreign aid program sought assurances today that the money will not be wasted.

"They asked Aid Director Henry B. Labouisse in a letter what steps he planned to take to prevent any further bad planning, waste, and unsuitable projects. They also asked what he intended to do about firing unsatisfactory aid officials.

"Their statement came as Assistant Senate Democratic Leader HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, spoke out on behalf of the most controversial feature of the President's aid plan.

#### **"CONTROVERSIAL FEATURE"**

"The provision would commit Congress to a 5-year aid program not subject to annual

appropriations as required in the past. This long-range financing feature faces a tough fight in the House and in the Senate which is now working on the aid bill.

"The Senate opened debate on the aid bill last week. The House will take up the bill later.

"Senator KEATING said in a statement that long-range aid planning was of crucial importance.

#### **"BERLIN CRISIS CITED"**

"Senator HUMPHREY declared in a separate statement that the Berlin crisis had underlined the need for consistent long-term aid planning.

"The letter by the 30 Democrats pointed up congressional concern about the long-range feature of the President's aid program. Most of the group consider themselves liberals and are firm supporters of the aid program.

"But they told Mr. Labouisse there had been 'documented instances of bad planning, waste and unsuitable projects.' They asked: 'What specifically will be done to prevent the repetition of such instances?'

#### **"CONSTRUCTIVELY CRITICAL"**

"The group, which represents 16 States, prefaced its query to Mr. Labouisse by saying it agrees that the President's foreign aid program 'is both essential to the security of the United States and consistent with the desires of the American people to encourage economic development and strengthen free political institutions in other nations.'

"But they said their duty to be 'constructively critical' prompted four questions, including the one on how waste will be stopped.

"They also wanted to know what will be done to make sure aid goes to the people who need it; how private business firms will be protected against expropriation or currency blocking; and what steps have been or will be taken to remove aid officials 'whose performance is unsatisfactory.'

"Representative JOHN BRADEMAs, Democrat, of Indiana, spokesman for the group, said that although its members believe in foreign aid, 'we are also convinced that our aid program abroad can be conducted more efficiently and effectively.'

The new Soviet feat of orbiting a man around the world for 25 hours is more dramatic evidence that in the struggle with the Communist world, brainpower is indispensable. That's why I feel those who insist on denying help to American education where it is really needed are playing Russian roulette with our national security.

It's therefore a tragedy that President Kennedy's three education bills are still mired down in the House and Senate. These bills would: (1) provide grants to States for more classrooms and/or better teachers' salaries; (2) provide loans and grants to colleges for academic facilities plus scholarships for needy, able students; (3) extend the National Defense Education Act.

If Congress fails to get a chance to vote on these bills, the losers will be American students and the national interest; the winners, Mr. Khrushchev and the Communist leaders, who are continuing to press their countries ahead scientifically and industrially.

In New York City a few weeks ago, I stood on street corners talking to young gang leaders who know—though still in their teens—all about murder and robbery and narcotics. The night our congressional subcommittee visited Brooklyn, a 17-year-old boy was beaten to death over a dime.

I'm convinced that juvenile delinquency is a problem that must be solved at the local level, not by the Federal Government. But youth crime is becoming so serious in many areas that I have introduced a bill to help

local communities tackle it. Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Secretaries Goldberg of Labor and Ribicoff of Health, Education, and Welfare have all testified in support of the bill, which would: (1) finance pilot projects to find better techniques to combat delinquency, and make the findings available nationwide; (2) help train more specialists to deal with delinquents and youthful offenders.

During our visit, one 18-year-old girl told us it would take just "three steps from my stoop" to find narcotics in New York. Few of us realize what jungles of crime exist in some of the towns and cities of our country.

A new frontier in TV has been opened by WNDU-TV with its "Washington Tie-Line" series. At WNDU's request I have been recruiting people with significant jobs in Washington for interviews with questioners on the other end of a long-distance line in South Bend. First guest, appropriately, was Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton Minow, fresh from his famous debut speech in which he described much of TV as a "wasteland" and called for more public service programs—like "Tie-Line". Next guest was the new U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, de-Lesseps S. Morrison. The Ambassador spoke of the "incomplete revolution" in Latin America and the task facing the United States in helping bring both social reform and economic progress to the rich but troubled continent south of us. Appearing on August 5, Miss Pamela Turnure, press secretary to Mrs. Kennedy, talked of her exciting job, which requires both long hours and much tact in dealing with the White House news corps.

## **Labor Day 1961**

### **EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as America pauses to observe Labor Day, 1961, it is fitting that we as Americans pause to reflect upon the special meaning and significance of Labor Day this year.

In the past, the labor of our people has resulted in the strongest and freest nation which this world has yet known. It was by labor that we expanded from our earliest beginnings in New England past our western continental boundaries to those great new and far distant States of Hawaii and Alaska. But these accomplishments should not lead us to believe that our labor has ended; in fact, the challenges of today cause us to rededicate ourselves to toil not only for the benefit of our great Nation but also for the entire world.

The international challenges of today are extreme. The free world looks to us for leadership; the entire world looks to us for the establishment and endurance of a lasting peace. Therefore, on this day which we set aside to pay tribute to labors past we must pause to reflect on the Nation's future and on our world's future. For the great burden of preserving our democratic heritage rests upon the American citizen whose work and in-